

Unclassified

ENV/JM/TG(2002)6



Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

30-Apr-2002

English - Or. English

**ENVIRONMENT DIRECTORATE
JOINT MEETING OF THE CHEMICALS COMMITTEE AND
THE WORKING PARTY ON CHEMICALS, PESTICIDES AND BIOTECHNOLOGY**

**ENV/JM/TG(2002)6
Unclassified**

Test Guidelines Programme

**PROPOSAL FOR A NEW TEST GUIDELINE 309: AEROBIC MINERALISATION IN SURFACE
WATER – SIMULATION BIODEGRADATION TEST**

**14th Meeting of the Working Group of the National Co-ordinators of the Test Guidelines Programme to
be held at the Château de la Muette, Paris, May 29th – 31st 2002**

JT00125400

Document complet disponible sur OLIS dans son format d'origine
Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

English - Or. English

This document provides a very brief summary of the development of Guideline 309: “Aerobic Mineralisation In Surface Water – Simulation Biodegradation Test . Attached to it is the revised proposal for Test Guideline 309 together with a compilation of all comments received. The revised Guideline proposal as well as the comments compilation were drafted by Denmark.

ACTION REQUIRED:

The Working Group of the National Co-ordinators of the Test Guidelines Programme are invited to:

- (i) take note of and discuss the revised proposals for the updated Guideline for TG309;***
- (ii) reach consensus on the revised new Guideline, amend as appropriate, and approve its submission to the Joint Meeting.***

BACKGROUND

1. The first version of this new Guideline was drafted by Denmark based on the ISO/DIS method 14952-1 and the adopted Guidelines 303, 307 and 308. Following its circulation in April 1999 to a limited number of experts, Denmark revised the first draft version taking into account comments and suggestions from these consulted experts. Subsequently, the first formal review was initiated in June 2000.

2. Comments on the June 2000 draft were received from seven countries (Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Switzerland the UK and the US). Italy and The Netherlands responded positively but made no comments. The draft Guideline was again revised by Denmark. Apart from considering all the comments received, Denmark also took into account elements of the proposed new paragraphs for assessment in the EU, as described in the White Paper (i.e. transformation data in surface water). In September 2001 the revised draft was circulated again, this time for final approval.

FINAL DRAFT GUIDELINE 309

3. Comments on the September 2001 version were received from Canada, Finland, Germany, Japan and USA. France, Ireland, Italy and the Netherlands approved the draft document without comments. Most comments were of an editorial nature and a few technical clarifications were made.

4. Denmark volunteered to revise the Guideline which is attached to this document as ANNEX 2. A compilation of comments together with responses, which was also compiled by and commented on by Denmark is attached as ANNEX 1.

OECD GUIDELINE FOR THE TESTING OF CHEMICALS

Compilation of Member countries' comments on the September 2001 draft proposal for a new Guideline 309 and responses to those comments

Aerobic Mineralisation in Surface Water – Simulation Biodegradation Test

This document comprises all comments received from Member Countries on the September 2001 revised proposal for a new Guideline 309 and responses to those comments made by the lead country, Denmark.

Comments were received from Canada, Finland, Germany, Japan and USA. France, Ireland, Italy and the Netherlands approved the draft document without comments.

The US comments came from followings:

USA-1: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Pesticide Programs; Environmental Fate & Effects Division; 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, Washington, D.C. 20460.

USA-2: Did not comment on Sept. 2001 draft; included here for reference: Rohm & Haas Company, Toxicology Department, 727 Norristown Road, Spring House, PA 19477.

USA-3: Did not comment on Sept. 2001 draft; included here for reference: Rohm & Haas Research Laboratory, Consumer & Industrial Specialties, 727 Norristown Road, Spring House, PA 19477.

USA-4: Did not comment on Sept. 2001 draft; included here for reference: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Research & Development; National Health & Environmental Effects Research Laboratory; Atlantic Ecology Division; Narragansett, RI 02882.

USA-5: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Pollution Prevention & Toxics; Economics, Exposure & Technology Division; 1200 Pennsylvania Ave, Washington, D.C. 20460.

GENERAL COMMENT		
Country	Comment	Response
Finland	There is a urgent need for a harmonised biodegradation test method which can provide kinetic data (biodegradation rates, half lives) simulating various environments and more realistic conditions.	
Germany	The new version benefits from a very careful revision, based on a number of various detailed and constructive comments. Due to this well done revision and improved precision we now consider the text proposal for this important guideline as ready for approval. <i>Only a few editorial comments and proposals are given in the following (proposed text amendments are marked <u>underlined</u>).</i>	
Germany	A uniform spelling of the term "mineralisation" / "mineralization" (e.g. heading vs. text) would be desirable.	Adopted. "mineralisation" has now been used throughout.
Japan	It is necessary to review some points again (e.g. information of physico-chemical properties of the test substance, the technical problems in the assessment with unlabelled-compound and so on).	
Paragraph 1		
Canada	Delete "draft" before OECD in line 3 (these guidelines have been adopted)	Adopted.
Paragraph 6		
USA-1	As requested earlier, this paragraph was amended to state that the water solubility of a test substance in natural waters may be below that in pure water (most literature values are for pure water).	Agree with US position.

	<p>However, additional and detailed guidance provided by commenter #4 regarding the previous draft [June 2000] was not but should be incorporated. That guidance [wa]s as follows: “There is a great deal of uncertainty associated with estimates of water solubility, as cited in the literature, for many organic compounds. The following are three examples. First, according to the literature (Anonymous, 1971) the azo dye, Direct Blue 15, is completely soluble in aqueous solutions. However, we found that the only aqueous media in which it is completely soluble in is deionized water; it is insoluble in fresh, brackish and marine waters. Two phases are formed upon entry into natural aqueous solutions, in direct proportion to ionic strength of the medium (Perez et al., 1985). Second, di-2-ethyhexylphthalate (DEHP), a commonly used industrial plasticizer, forms a surface slick at concentrations as low as 1µg/l in seawater (Davey et al., 1990). In such a two phase system, the solubility of DEHP is over two orders of magnitude lower than a cited literature value (Howard et al., 1985). Finally, Smith (1976) reported a water solubility for the pesticide, Kepone of 2000 µg/l, using data obtained from Allied Chemical Corporation. Water solubility for Kepone in our laboratory (Davey, personal comm.) was measured to be 1.03±0.38µg/l, three orders of magnitude lower. These three experiences have shown us that a user could well be misled by simply using cited literature values of water solubility for the test substance. Solubilities can be significantly lower.”</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Not agree. Two sentences were added to the end of paragraph 6 to address the original comment and this seems sufficient. Although the comments here are thoughtful and appreciated, it is probably not necessary or appropriate to go into such great detail for this TG.</p>	
Paragraph 8		
Japan	<p>“The following information on the test substance should be available” in the 8th line should be revised to “The following information on the test substance had better be possessed”, because a</p>	<p>Not adopted. The statement is consistent with recently adopted Test Guidelines, i.e. TG307 and 308.</p>

	scientifically suitable evaluation can be made even in the absence of these data. For instance, when $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ generated is determined with ^{14}C -labelled test substance, we can suitably assess even at the concentration exceeding the water solubility.	
Paragraph 9		
Japan	“The following information should be also available” in the 1 st line should be revised to “the following information also had better be possessed”, because a scientifically suitable evaluation can be made even in the absence of these data. For instance, when $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ generated is determined with ^{14}C -labelled test substance, we can also suitably assess the test substances absorbed or adsorbed with bacteria.	See above response.
Paragraph 10		
Germany	last point – Proposal: it should be considered to include references to guidelines 307 and 308 in brackets: "... - aerobic or anaerobic biodegradability in soil and sediment/water transformation studies [OECD 307, OECD 308]."	Agree. Reference to TG307 and TG308 has been inserted.
Paragraph 11		
Japan	When unlabelled aniline or sodium benzoate is used, it is thought that a specific analysis is very difficult in consideration of the concentration. Thus, the guidance for the specific analytical methods of unlabelled reference substances should be described.	Not agree in the need to describe analytical methods for reference substances. The description in this Guideline proposal is consistent with recently adopted Test Guidelines, i.e. TG307 and 308. See response to comment of Japan to para. 28.
Paragraph 15		
Canada	Insert “(see paragraph 26)” after ‘suitable’ in line 6.	Adopted.

Paragraph 16		
Japan	We consider that distilled water can be also used.	Not adopted. The description in this Guideline proposal is consistent with recently adopted Test Guidelines, i.e. TG307 and 308.
Paragraph 17		
Japan	It is stated that “if it is known that an aquatic environment has been contaminated with the test substance or its structural analogues within the previous four years, it should not be used for the collection of test”, but the sentence should be corrected to “surface water in the specially contaminated sites should not be used”. Some chemicals can be generally detected from the surface water when relatively much amounts of chemicals are used, but the structural analogues cannot be tested according to this guideline when there are chemicals universally detected in surface waters as well as the specified waters.	Not adopted. The description in this Guideline proposal is consistent with recently adopted Test Guidelines, i.e. TG307 and 308. See response to comment from USA-5 to para. 17.
USA-5	<p>It is stated that aquatic environments known to be or to have been contaminated with test substance or related substances should not be used in the test. Restriction to uncontaminated sites seems arbitrary. This may be the way the guideline is normally applied, but it is easy to envision situations in which the investigator's purpose is to assess degradation rates for specific sites of release to the environment. It is quite possible that these may include sites known to have been exposed. Why not include language that at least <i>allows</i> the possibility?</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. Suggest adding a clause as follows: “...should not be used for the collection of test water, <i>unless investigation of degradation rates in previously exposed sites is the express purpose of the investigator.</i>”</p>	Agree with US position. The suggested wordings have been inserted.
Canada	As this study needs to be carried out under aerobic conditions, it is important to measure the oxidation status of the surface water and sediment at the time of collection and during the experiment. Periodic	The commenter is right in pointing out that it is essential to ensure aerobic conditions, and suggests that oxygen/redox conditions be measured. The systems under investigation,

	<p>measurement and reporting of oxygen concentration/redox potential is necessary when there is prolonged incubation, and also when closed systems are used.</p> <p>Therefore,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) insert “oxygen concentration or redox potential” after pH in line 5, para 17. 2) insert “The pH and redox potential of the sediment should be measured before 	<p>both field sites that are sampled and simulated and subsequent lab systems, are often known to be aerobic making measurements unnecessary. However, the importance of ensuring aerobic conditions should be emphasized by stating that oxygen/redox conditions must be measured and aerobic conditions documented if not self-evident from the experimental conditions, or in the field from the appearance of the site.</p> <p>The commenters suggestion has been modified and inserted as follows:</p> <p>“Oxygen concentration and/or redox potential in the water and in the sediment surface layer should be measured in order to demonstrate aerobic conditions unless this is obvious as judged from appearance and historic experience with the site”.</p>
Paragraph 18		
Germany	<p>last sentence – Proposal: In accordance to the wording in TG 308, please include that storage should not exceed a maximum of four weeks: "... .Storage of the sediment, if needed should be minimised and must in any case not exceed a maximum of 4 weeks."</p>	Agree. The suggested wordings have been inserted.
Japan	<p>It is thought that “Biofilm” should be included in “Surface sediment”, because a biofilm adhered to river solid (stone, etc.) consists of various types of bacterial groups and plays important roles for purification of water quality.</p>	Not adopted. This method is restricted to suspended microorganisms and does not include biofilm. A river-bed simulation test is presently being developed by ISO (ISO/FDIS 14592 part II)
USA-1	<p>As requested in the first round of comments, this paragraph has been</p>	Agree. The first sentence has been rewritten as suggested

	<p>revised to indicate that the natural water should be filtered before surface sediment is added. However, it should also indicate how the filtration should be done, by referring back to paragraph 17.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. Rewrite the first sentence as follows: "...surface sediment is added to the flasks containing natural water (filtered to remove coarse particles as described in paragraph 17) to obtain a suspension..."</p>	<p>by US position.</p>
<p>Paragraph 21</p>		
<p>USA-1</p>	<p>Paragraph 21 and 28: As suggested by commenter #4 regarding the previous draft, the guideline was amended to include solvent controls. However, the guideline still misses the point of this control which is to look at CO₂ derived from biodegradation of the solvent, not to check for effects of the solvent on the test substance biodegradability. This control should contain site water, test compound and <i>additional</i> solvent relative to amount normally used in order to evaluate solvent effects in terms of CO₂ released as a result of biodegradation of the solvent.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Not agree. There is much confusion here and the US position on the previous draft shares the blame. The following attempts to clarify the issue. The purpose of the control is to check for possible adverse effects of the solvent (i.e. microbial toxicity) by determining the degradation of a reference substance. This is clearly stated in paragraph 21, which contains revised wording that is adequate to describe this control (last two sentences). The confusion probably results from failure to recognize that since ¹⁴C-labeled test substance is normally used, CO₂ from solvent is not an issue. Yes, specific analysis is also an option, but here one follows test substance and possibly products <i>other than CO₂</i>. There is another point. It is that commenter #1 cites commenter #4 here, but in fact misses the latter's point. That point had nothing to do with CO₂ from the solvent. Rather it was that solvent effects should be measured quantitatively,</p>	<p>Agree with US position.</p>

	such as in determining the LC ₅₀ in an aquatic tox test. This issue was addressed in the earlier round of comments and does not need to be raised again.	
Paragraph 23		
Finland	Paragraph 23, 26: The needed agitation and its description could be compactly described in one paragraph.	Agree. Agitation is now described in para. 23.
Paragraph 25		
Japan	The reason why the test should be conducted at two concentrations with 5-10 times difference should be clarified.	Not adopted. The statement is consistent with recently adopted Test Guidelines, i.e. TG307 and 308.
Paragraph 26		
Finland	The needed agitation and its description could be compactly described in one paragraph.	Agree. Agitation is now described in para. 23.
Paragraph 27		
USA-1	<p>Sampling times in hours (vs. days) may be appropriate for the more labile compounds, particularly those susceptible to hydrolysis. Note that both commenter #1 and commenter #2 made essentially the same comment in response to the previous draft.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. The solution is to add a sentence to paragraph 27 as follows: "Under certain circumstances, such as with very rapidly hydrolyzing substances, it may be necessary to sample at hourly intervals." Add it after the current sentence that says "If the substance is rapidly degradable, sampling..."</p>	Agree. The sentence suggested by US position has been inserted.
Paragraph 28		

Japan	The guideline says that the test concentration of reference control (e.g. aniline or sodium benzoate) is 10 µg/L. Is the determination really possible when unlabelled-compound is used? (See comment of Paragraph 11.)	The substance concentration at 10 µg/L is for the reference control is intended for radiolabelled compounds. We are aware that a determination of the proposed reference substances at 10 µg/L is difficult by use of chemical analytical methods. Therefore the following text has been added to para. 28: The purpose of the reference control is to confirm a minimum of microbial activity. If convenient, a radiolabelled reference substance may be used, also when the degradation of the test substance is monitored by chemical analyses.
USA-1	It is stated that using the sterile control is an “option”. This is a must-do item. <u>US position:</u> Agree. Delete the word “optionally”.	Agree. “Optionally” has been deleted.
USA-1	As suggested by commenter 2 on the prior draft, autoclaving may alter the sorption characteristics of the sediment. However, presently there is no cautionary statement in the guideline. A statement should be added to paragraph 28 and also paragraph 49, which lists information that must be reported. <u>US position:</u> Agree, but paragraph 28 does in fact include the sediment autoclaving caution, so the commenter is incorrect in that regard. However, in the test conditions list in paragraph 49 there is no explicit mention of the need to report time and temperature of autoclaving. This should be added.	As autoclaving is probably the most common method to obtain sterile conditions, the sentence addressing the methods used for sterilization of the sample in para. 49 now specifies “e.g. temperature, time and number of autoclavings”.
Paragraph 32		
USA-1	It appears that “total mineralization” would be determined by evolution of $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ as a result of acidifying at pH 2-3. Another option would be to determine the actual concentration of $\text{H}^{14}\text{CO}_3^- / ^{14}\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ either using an analytical method or by calculations based on the pH-	Not adopted. Determining mineralisation by the concentration of $\text{H}^{14}\text{CO}_3^- / ^{14}\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ requires that the equilibrium of $^{14}\text{CO}_2 / \text{H}^{14}\text{CO}_3^- / ^{14}\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ can be accurately confirmed. This is difficult and regarded as an unnecessary

	<p>dependent equilibrium for the $^{14}\text{CO}_2/\text{H}^{14}\text{CO}_3^-/^{14}\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ system.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. Suggest adding a new paragraph after current paragraph 36. The original sentence from commenter #1 as shown at left (“Another option...”) is fine.</p>	<p>complication of the method.</p>
Paragraph 37		
USA-1	<p>As suggested earlier this paragraph has been greatly improved by addition of discussion concerning possible analysis of transformation products. However, the emphasis is different from that suggested. The suggested emphasis was on identification of transformation products formed when abiotic transformation, and especially hydrolysis, occurs much faster than biotransformation. This emphasis accords measurement of product formation in sterile (abiotic) controls special importance; yet, paragraph 37 does not mention the abiotic controls.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree with the substance of the comment. The revised paragraph 37 does address the product issue from the standpoint of possible formation of persistent products in the biotransformation test. This seems OK as is. However, suggest adding explicit mention that it may be of interest to analyze for products in sterile controls, if rapid hydrolysis is thought possible.</p>	<p>It is now specifically mentioned in para. 37 that it should be considered to analyse for abiotic transformation products, if rapid abiotic transformation is thought possible.</p>
Paragraph 38		
USA-1	<p>The paragraph says “all samples should be stored at 2-4 °C and air-tight if analysis is carried out within 24 hours (preferred). For longer storage, the samples should be frozen below -18 °C or chemically</p>	<p>Agree. The last sentence of the commenter has been added to para. 38.</p>

	<p>preserved.” If the samples are not analyzed within 24 hours and are subject to longer storage, a storage stability study should be conducted to demonstrate the stability of chemicals of interest under -18 °C storage or preserved conditions.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. Add the commenter’s last sentence to paragraph 38.</p>	
USA-1	<p>The sentence “If it is known that the test substance will remain unaffected by acidification, acidify to pH 2 before storing” has been marked for deletion. However, this is action is insufficient to address concerns for stability of acidified samples (as noted by commenters 1&2 on the prior draft). The guideline should say that analysis should be carried out immediately if possible, and if not, acidification before storage is acceptable but only under the described conditions.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree with the substance of the comment. Moreover, the safest policy may be to add a sentence that actively <i>discourages</i> analysis after storage of acidified samples. In other words: the guideline deals with this issue by simply deleting the sentence that allows the practice; but the US position is to take a more active stance and add a sentence that says don’t do it.</p>	<p>Agree. The following sentence has been inserted in para. 38: Acidification is not a recommended methods to preserve the samples, because acidified samples may be unstable.</p>
Paragraph 40		
Japan	<p>The definition of “identical” should be clarified.</p>	<p>The sentence in para. 40 has been modified to: “If the means of the results from the flasks with test substance (F_T) and the sterile flasks (F_S) <u>deviate by less than 10%</u>, it can be assumed that the degradation observed is predominantly abiotic.”.</p>
USA-1	<p>Para. 40- para. 43: Given the kinds of analysis tools that are readily and cheaply available, the level of analysis discussed in sections 40-43 may be obsolete. Non first-order models can fit the data easily using non-linear regression with spreadsheets, graphics packages, and data analysis software. At the least, a statement should be added that</p>	<p>Agree that the use of modern software should be encouraged. The sentence “Analytical tools to facilitate statistical calculations and curve fitting are easily available and the use of this kind of software is recommended” has</p>

	<p>mentions and encourages the use of modern data analysis and graphics software. These tools can also be used to give information on whether differences among half-lives reported for replicates are statistically significant. The guideline should state that this information should be provided if available.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. It might be easiest to do this as a new paragraph after current paragraph 41 or 43.</p>	<p>been added to para. 41.</p>
Paragraph 41		
USA-1	<p>This paragraph and Annex 1, which contains related definitions, is still confusing in regard to the various ways of expressing degradation kinetics. We have found it very useful to differentiate the half-life from the DT_{50}. The half-life is the natural logarithm of 2 divided by the rate constant. The half-life is only a valid concept when first-order kinetics describe the reaction. The DT_{50} is the time required for 50% of the initial reactant to degrade; it is empirically defined and independent of any kinetics model. However, all reference to DT_{50} was removed from Annex 1. It should be put back in, and paragraph 41 should more clearly discuss the main kinetic concepts.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree that there are problems here. Suggested solution: reword the para. 41 sentence as follows: "...state the duration of the lag phase and the degradation half-time (DT_{50}), which is the time needed to reach 50% biodegradation." Then, in Annex 1, do the following: (i) Delete the term (but not the definition itself!) "Degradation half-time", and replace with "Half-life" which is the more generally used</p>	<p>Agree. Para. 41 and Annex 1 have been revised and now include the terms proposed by the commenter.</p>

	term corresponding to this definition; (ii) Delete “Half-life time” and its definition, since they are not widely used; and (iii) Add “Degradation half time” plus its correct definition, which includes the lag phase, and call it DT ₅₀ , as in the comment at left. The comment at left is concise, lucid and accurate and should be emulated.	
Japan	Paragraph 40 and ANNEX1: “ $t_{1/2} = -\ln 2/k$ ” should be corrected to “ $t_{1/2} = \ln 2/k$ ”.	Agree. This has been corrected in para. 41 and Annex 1.
Paragraph 46		
USA-1	<p>This paragraph was amended to include mention of use of radiochromatography to determine concentrations of radiolabeled test substance and major transformation products. However, as noted by commenters 2&3 on the prior draft, RAD-TLC should be mentioned specifically and its use should be encouraged.</p> <p><u>US position:</u> Agree. A satisfactory solution is to add “RAD-TLC” in parentheses after ‘radiochromatography’.</p>	Agree. The addition proposed by US position has been inserted.
USA-1	<p>As suggested by commenter 2 on the prior draft, the Sept. 2001 draft modified the text to state that if major (>10%) metabolites are present, “a detailed evaluation of the data is required...” However, the added guidance is inadequate and additional guidance is needed.</p> <p><u>US position:</u> Not agree. There already is more guidance immediately after the phrase “a detailed evaluation of the data is required.” Namely, “...which may include repeated testing...”, etc. This seems sufficient. Specific language could have suggested if this was not adequate (i.e., see below).</p>	Agree with US position.
USA-5	This paragraph says "No major...products ($\geq 10\%$ of the applied amount) should be present for a direct estimation of the half-life of the test substance". It then says "In such cases, a detailed evaluation of the test data is required." In which cases? When there are major	Agree. Modifications as described by US position have been inserted.

	<p>products $\geq 10\%$ of the applied amount, or when there are not? This should be clarified.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. Suggest using the following wording, which should be clear: "To enable a direct estimation of the half-life of the test substance, it is necessary that no major transformation products (defined as $\geq 10\%$ of the applied amount of test substance) be present. If major transformation products as defined here are present, a detailed evaluation of the data is required..."</p>	
Paragraph 47		
Finland	<p>The reason for different rates in Mid-European waters and in Nordic (rather than Scandinavian) countries could be the trophic status of waters, but possibly also the previous history of background contamination with various chemical substances and subsequent adaptation of microbial communities. This should perhaps also be considered.</p>	The text has been amended as proposed by the commenter.
Japan	<p>Pass level (the percentage degradation) of reference substance should be clarified.</p>	Not agree. A pass level does not make sense in a simulation test.
Paragraph 48		
Japan	<p>"48" is missing.</p>	Adopted.
Paragraph 49		
Japan	<p>What is a difference between "nutrient status (Surface water; minimum information)" and "nutrients (Surface water; optionally)"? Moreover, "the level of quantification (LOQ)" should be corrected to "the limit of quantification (LOQ)".</p>	This has been clarified. Measurements of nutrients are now included in the minimum information which must be provided.

USA-1	<p>Only “chemical names” for the test substance and its transformation products are mentioned. OPP had requested that the test report include IUPAC or CAS nomenclatures, but this issue was ignored. The report must include IUPAC and/or CAS nomenclatures for the test substance and its transformation products.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree in principle, but do not agree with the “<i>must</i> include”. Solution: recommend IUPAC and/or CAS names, but do not make it an absolute requirement. The problem here is that in some cases it may be difficult or even impossible to identify the correct IUPAC or CAS name; for example for some poorly characterized degradation products. Yet, this does not necessarily compromise the integrity of the study. Add parentheses after “chemical names”: (recommend IUPAC and/or CAS names).</p>	<p>Agree with the proposal of US position; the text has been amended accordingly.</p>
USA-1	<p>Inorganic carbon must be measured and reported for surface water samples used in the study.</p> <p><u>US position:</u></p> <p>Agree. This needs to be added to the “Surface water” list in paragraph 49.</p>	<p>Not agree. Since it is not recommended to estimate mineralisation by use of the equilibrium of $^{14}\text{CO}_2 / \text{H}^{14}\text{CO}_3^- / ^{14}\text{CO}_3^{2-}$, the measurement of inorganic carbon does not need to be a mandatory requirement. It is included as an optional analysis.</p>
Canada	<p>Insert “oxygen concentration or redox potential” after “pH” in section on surface water.</p> <p>Insert “redox potential” after “pH” in line 3.</p> <p>Insert “periodic measurement of oxygen concentration/redox potential in water and sediment” at the end of section on test conditions.</p>	<p>Partially agree. Normally we do not find it necessary to measure oxygen as suggested. Therefore, the following wordings have been inserted (section “surface water”):</p> <p>“Oxygen concentration or redox potential (mandatory only if aerobic conditions are not obvious)”, and</p> <p>“Periodic measurements of oxygen concentration or redox potential in water and sediment must be conducted to demonstrate aerobic conditions unless previous experience or other evidence make such measurements unnecessary.”</p>

LITERATURE		
USA-1	Literature (1): typo in original TG (numbers reversed in reference) was not corrected. <u>US position:</u> Agree. Please fix. Should be ISO/DIS 14592-1.	Adopted.

ANNEX 2Revised Draft
April 2002**OECD GUIDELINE FOR THE TESTING OF CHEMICALS****PROPOSAL FOR A NEW GUIDELINE 309****Aerobic Mineralisation in Surface Water – Simulation Biodegradation Test****INTRODUCTION**

1. This simulation test is a laboratory shake flask batch test to determine rates of aerobic biodegradation of organic substances in samples of natural surface water (fresh, brackish or marine). It is based on the ISO/DIS 14592-1 (1) and it also includes elements from the ~~draft~~ OECD Guidelines 307 and 308 (2)(3). Optionally, with long test times, semi-continuous operation replaces batch operation in order to prevent deterioration of the test microcosm. The test is designed to provide information on the biodegradation and kinetic rates of a test substance at low concentration in aerobic natural water. Low concentration means a concentration (e.g. less than 1 µg/l to 100 µg/l) which is low enough to ensure that the biodegradation kinetics obtained in the test reflect those expected in the environment. Compared to the total mass of biodegradable carbon substrates available in the natural water used for the test, the test substance present at low concentration will serve as a secondary substrate. This implies that the anticipated biodegradation kinetics are first order (“non-growth” kinetics) and that the test substance may be degraded by “cometabolism”. First order kinetics implies that the specific rate of degradation (expressed in units per time) is constant and independent of the concentration of the test substance. Although first order kinetics are normally expected under the prescribed conditions, there may be certain circumstances where other kinetics are more appropriate. Deviations from first order kinetics may, e.g., be observed if mass transfer phenomena such as diffusion rate, rather than the biological reaction rate, is limiting the rate of biotransformation. However, the data can nearly always be described by pseudo first order kinetics accepting a concentration dependent rate constant. The principal objective of the simulation test is to determine the mineralisation of the test substance in surface water, and mineralisation constitutes the basis for expressing degradation kinetics. However, the test may also be used to obtain information on the primary degradation and the formation of major transformation products. Identification of transformation products, and if possible quantification of their concentrations, are especially important for substances that are slowly mineralized (e.g. with half-lives exceeding 60 days). Higher concentrations of the test substance (e.g., >100 µg/l) should normally be used for identification and quantification of major transformation products due to analytical limitations.

2. Information on biodegradability of the test substance at higher concentrations (e.g. from standard screening tests) as well as information on abiotic degradability, transformation products and relevant physico-chemical properties should be available prior to the test to help establish the experimental planning and interpret the results. The use of ¹⁴C labelled test substances and the determination of the phase distribution of ¹⁴C at the end of the test, enable ultimate biodegradability to be determined. When

non-labelled test substance is used, ultimate biodegradation can only be estimated if a higher concentration is tested and all the major transformation products are known.

3. See Annex 1 for definitions and units.

GENERAL PRINCIPLE OF THE TEST

4. The test is performed in batch by incubating the test substance with either surface water only ("pelagic test") or surface water amended with suspended solids/sediment of approximately 1 g/l dry weight ("suspended sediment test") to simulate a water body with suspended solids or re-suspended sediment. The test flasks are incubated in darkness at an environmental temperature under aerobic conditions and agitation. At least two different concentrations of test substance should be used in order to determine the degradation kinetics. The concentrations should differ from each other by a factor of 5 to 10 and should represent the expected range of concentrations in the environment. The maximum concentration of the test substance should be 100 µg/l, but concentrations below 10 µg/l are preferred to ensure that the biodegradation follows first order kinetics. The lowest concentration should preferably be 1-2 µg/l or less than 1 µg/l dependent on the technique for measuring mineralisation. Normally such low concentration can be achieved by use of commercially available ¹⁴C-labelled substances. Because of analytical limitations, it is frequently impossible to measure the concentration of test substance with the required accuracy, if the test substance is applied at a concentration ≤100 µg/l (see paragraph 14). Higher concentrations of test substance (>100 µg/l and sometimes >1 mg/l) may be used for the identification and quantification of major transformation products or if a specific analysis method with a low detection limit is not available. If high concentrations of test substance are tested, it may not be possible to use the results to estimate the first order degradation constant and half-life, as the degradation will probably not follow first order kinetics.

5. Degradation is followed at appropriate time intervals, by measuring either the residual ¹⁴C or the residual concentration of test substance when specific chemical analysis is used. ¹⁴C labelling of the most stable part of the molecule ensures the determination of the total mineralisation, while ¹⁴C labelling of a less stable part of the molecule, as well as the use of specific analysis, enables the assessment of only primary biodegradation. However, the most stable part does not necessarily include the relevant functional moiety of the molecule (that can be related to a specific property such as toxicity, bioaccumulation, etc.). If this is the case, it may be appropriate to use a test substance, which is ¹⁴C-labelled, in the functional part in order to follow the elimination of the specific property.

APPLICABILITY OF THE TEST

6. This simulation test is applicable to non-volatile or slightly volatile organic substances tested at low concentrations. Using flasks open to the atmosphere (e.g. cotton wool plugged), substances with Henry's law constants less than about 1 Pa · m³/mol (approx. 10⁻⁵ atm · m³/mol) can be regarded as non-volatile in practice. Using closed flasks with a headspace, it is possible to test slightly volatile substances (with Henry's law constants <100 Pa · m³/mol or <10⁻³ atm · m³/mol) without losses from the test system. Loss of ¹⁴C-labelled substances may occur, if the right precautions are not exercised, when the CO₂ is stripped off. In such situations, it may be necessary to trap CO₂ in an internal absorber with alkali or to use an external CO₂ absorber system (direct ¹⁴CO₂ determination; see Annex 4). For the determination of biodegradation kinetics, the concentrations of the test substance must be below its water solubility. It should be noted, however, that literature values of water solubility may be considerably higher than the

solubility of the test substance in natural waters. Optionally, the solubility of especially poorly water-soluble test substances may be established by use of the natural waters being tested.

7. The method can be used for simulating biodegradation in surface water free of coarse particles ("pelagic test") or in turbid surface water, e.g. a water/sediment interface or a water body with re-suspended sediment ("suspended sediment test").

INFORMATION ON THE TEST SUBSTANCE

8. Both radiolabelled and non-labelled test substances can be used in this test. ¹⁴C-labelling technique is recommended and labelling should normally be in the most stable part(s) of the molecule (see also paragraph 5). For substances containing more than one aromatic ring, one or more carbons in each ring should preferably be ¹⁴C-labelled. In addition, one or more carbons on both sides of easily degradable linkages should preferably be ¹⁴C-labelled. The chemical and/or radiochemical purity of the test substance should be >95%. For radiolabelled substances, a specific activity of approx. 50 µCi/mg (1.85 MBq) or more is preferred in order to facilitate ¹⁴C measurements in tests conducted with low initial concentrations. The following information on the test substance should be available:

- solubility in water [OECD 105] (4);
- solubility in organic solvent(s) (substances applied with solvent or with low solubility in water);
- dissociation constant (pKa) if the substance is liable to protonation or deprotonation [OECD 112] (4);
- vapour pressure [OECD 104] (4) and Henry's law constant;
- chemical stability in water and in the dark (hydrolysis) [OECD 111] (4).

When poorly water-soluble substances are being tested in seawater, it may also be useful to know the salting out constant (or "Setschenow constant") K^s , which is defined by the expression: $\log(S/S') = K^s \cdot C_m$, where S and S' are the solubility of the substance in fresh water and seawater, respectively, and C_m is the molar salt concentration.

9. If the test is carried out as a "suspended sediment test" the following information should also be available:

- n-octanol/water partition coefficient [OECD 107, 117] (4);
- adsorption coefficient [OECD 106] (4);

10. Other useful information may include:

- environmental concentration, if known or estimated;
- toxicity of the test substance to microorganisms [OECD 209];
- ready and/or inherent biodegradability [OECD 301, OECD 302];
- aerobic or anaerobic biodegradability in soil and sediment/water transformation studies (OECD 307, 308).

REFERENCE SUBSTANCE

11. A substance, which is normally easily degraded under aerobic conditions (e.g. aniline or sodium benzoate) should be used as reference substance. The expected time interval for degradation of aniline and

sodium benzoate is usually less than 2 weeks. The purpose of the reference substances is to ensure that the microbial activity of the test water is within certain limits; i.e., that the water contains an active microbial population.

QUALITY CRITERIA

Recovery

12. Immediately after addition of the test substance, each test concentration should be measured in at least duplicate samples. This provides information on the applicability and repeatability of the analytical method and on the homogeneity of the distribution of the test substance. For ¹⁴C-labelled test substance, the level of recovery at the end of the experiment is given by mass balance (see also paragraph 36). Ideally, recoveries should range from 90% to 110% for ¹⁴C-labelled substances and from 70% to 110% for non-labelled substances. These ranges should be interpreted as targets and should not be used as criteria for acceptance of the test.

Repeatability and sensitivity of analytical method

13. Repeatability of the analytical method (excluding the efficiency of the initial extraction) to quantify the test substance, and transformation products, if appropriate, should be checked by five replicate analyses of the same extract of the surface water.

14. The limit of detection (LOD) of the analytical method for the test substance and for the transformation products should be at least 1% of the initial amount applied to the test system if possible. The limit of quantification (LOQ) should be equal to or less than 10% of the applied concentration. The chemical analyses of many organic substances and their transformation products frequently require that the test substance is applied at a relatively high concentration, i.e. >100 µg/l.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TEST METHOD

Equipment

15. The test may be conducted in conical or cylindrical flasks of appropriate capacity (e.g. 0.5 or 1.0 litre) closed with silicone or rubber stoppers, or in serum flasks with CO₂-tight lids (e.g. with butyl rubber septa). Another option is to perform the test by use of multiple flasks and to harvest whole flasks, at least in duplicate, at each sample interval (see paragraph 27). For non-volatile test substances that are not radiolabelled, gas-tight stoppers or lids are not required; loose cotton plugs that prevent contamination from air are suitable (see paragraph 26). Slightly volatile substances should be tested in a biometer-type system with gentle stirring of the water surface. To be sure that no bacterial contamination occurs, optionally the vessels can be sterilised by heating or autoclaving prior to use. In addition, the following standard laboratory equipment is used:

- shaking table or magnetic stirrers for continuous agitation of the test flasks;
- centrifuge;
- pH meter;
- turbidimeter for nephelometric turbidity measurements;
- oven or microwave oven for dry weight determinations;
- membrane filtration apparatus;

- autoclave or oven for heat sterilisation of glassware;
- facilities to handle ¹⁴C-labelled substances;
- equipment to quantify ¹⁴C-activity in samples from CO₂-trapping solutions and, if required, from sediment samples;
- analytical equipment for the determination of the test (and reference) substance if specific chemical analysis is used (e.g. gas chromatograph, high-pressure liquid chromatograph).

Stock solutions of test substance

16. Deionized water is used to prepare stock solutions of the test and reference substances (see also paragraph 20). The deionized water should be free of substances that may be toxic to microorganisms, and dissolved organic carbon (DOC) should be no more than 1 mg/l (5).

Collection of surface water

17. The sampling site for collection of the surface water should be selected in accordance with the purpose of the test in any given situation. In selecting sampling sites, the history of possible agricultural, industrial or domestic inputs must be considered. If it is known that an aquatic environment has been contaminated with the test substance or its structural analogues within the previous four years, it should not be used for the collection of test water, unless investigation of degradation rates in previously exposed sites is the express purpose of the investigator. The pH and temperature of the water should be measured at the site of collection. Furthermore, the depth of sampling and the appearance of the water sample (e.g. colour and turbidity) should be noted (see paragraph 49). Oxygen concentration and/or redox potential in water and in the sediment surface layer should be measured in order to demonstrate aerobic conditions unless this is obvious as judged from appearance and historic experience with the site. The surface water should be transported in a thoroughly cleansed container. During transport and storage, the temperature of the sample should not significantly exceed the temperature used in the test. Cooling to 4°C is recommended if transport duration exceeds 2 to 3 hours. The water sample must not be frozen. Prior to use, the coarse particles should be removed, e.g. by filtration through a nylon filter with about 100 µm mesh size or with a coarse paper filter, or by sedimentation. The test should preferably be started within one day after sample collection. Storage of the water, if needed, should be minimised and must in any case not exceed a maximum of 4 weeks. The water sample should be kept at 4°C with aeration until use.

Preparation of water amended with sediment [optional]

18. For the suspended sediment test, surface sediment is added to the flasks containing filtered natural water (filtered to remove coarse particles as described in paragraph 17) to obtain a suspension; the concentration of suspended solids should be approximately 1g/l. The surface sediment should come from the same site as that from which the water sample was taken. Dependent on the particular aquatic environment, the surface sediment may either be characterised by a high organic carbon content (2.5-7.5%) and a fine texture or by a low organic carbon content (0.5-2.5%) and a coarse texture (2). The surface sediment can be prepared as follows: extract several sediment cores using a tube of transparent plastic, slice off the upper aerobic layers (from surface to a depth of max. 5 mm) immediately after sampling and pool them together. The resulting sediment sample should be transported in a container with a large air headspace to keep the sediment under aerobic conditions (cool to 4°C if transport duration exceeds 2-3 hours). The sediment sample should be suspended in the test water at a ratio of 1:10 and kept at 4°C with aeration until use. Storage of the sediment, if needed, should be minimised and must not in any case exceed a maximum of 4 weeks.

Semi-continuous procedure [optional]

19. Prolonged incubation (several months) may be necessary if a long lag time occurs before a significant degradation of the test substance can be measured. If this is known from previous testing of a substance, the test may be initiated by using a semi-continuous procedure, which allows periodical renewal of a part of the test water or suspension (see Annex 3). Alternatively, the normal batch test may be changed into a semi-continuous test, if no degradation of the test substance has been achieved during approximately 60 days of testing using the batch procedure (see also paragraph 24).

Addition of the test (or reference) substance

20. For substances with high water solubility (>1 mg/l) and low volatility (Henry's law constants <1 Pa · m³/mol or $< 10^{-5}$ atm · m³/mol), a stock solution can be prepared in deionized water (see paragraph 16); the appropriate volume of the stock solution is added to the test vessels to achieve the desired concentration. The volume of any added stock solution should be held to the practical minimum ($<10\%$ of the final liquid volume, if possible). Another procedure is to dissolve the test substance in a larger volume of the test water, which may be seen as an alternative to the use of organic solvents.

21. If unavoidable, stock solutions of non-volatile substances with poor water-solubility should be prepared by use of a volatile organic solvent, but the amount of solvent added to the test system should not exceed 1% v/v and should not have adverse effects on the microbial activity. The solvent should not affect the stability of the test substance in water. The solvent should be stripped off to an extremely small quantity so that it does not significantly increase the DOC concentration of the test water or suspension. This should be checked by substance-specific analysis or, if possible DOC analysis (5). Care must be taken to limit the amount of solvent transferred to what is absolutely necessary and to ensure that the amount of test substance can dissolve in the final volume of test water. Other techniques to introduce the test substance into the test vessels may be used as described in (6) and (7). When an organic solvent is used for application of the test substance, solvent controls containing the test water (with no additions) and test water with added reference substance should be treated similarly to active test vessels amended with test substance in solvent carrier. The purpose of the solvent controls is to examine possible adverse effects caused by the solvent towards the microbial population as indicated by the degradation of the reference substance.

Test conditions**Test temperature**

22. Incubation should take place in the dark (preferred) or in diffuse light at a controlled ($\pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$) temperature, which may be the field temperature or a standard temperature of 20-25°C. Field temperature may be either the actual temperature of the sample at the sampling time or an average field temperature at the sampling site.

Agitation

23. Agitation by means of continuous shaking or stirring must be provided to maintain particles and microorganisms in suspension. Agitation also facilitates oxygen transfer from the headspace to the liquid so that aerobic conditions can be adequately maintained. Place the flasks on a shaking table (approx. 100 rpm agitation) or use magnetic stirring. Agitation must be continuous and sufficient to maintain a homogeneous suspension.

Test duration

24. The duration of the test should normally not exceed 60 days unless the semi-continuous procedure with periodical renewal of the test suspension is applied (see paragraph 19 and Annex 3). However, the test period for the batch test may be extended to a maximum of 90 days, if the degradation of the test substance has started within the first 60 days. Degradation is monitored, at appropriate time intervals, by the determination of the residual concentration of test substance or its mineralisation using ^{14}C measurements (see paragraphs 32-36) and, optionally, by chemical analysis (paragraphs 37-39). The incubation time must be sufficiently long to evaluate the degradation process. The extent of degradation should preferably exceed 50%; for slowly degradable substances, the extent of degradation must be sufficient (normally greater than 20% degradation) to ensure the estimation of a kinetic degradation rate constant.

PROCEDURE

Preparation of flasks for pelagic test

25. Transfer a suitable volume of test water to the test flasks, up to about one third of the flask volume and not less than about 100 ml. If multiple flasks are used (to allow harvesting of whole flasks at each sampling time), the appropriate volume of test water is also about 100 ml, as small sample volumes may influence the length of the lag phase. The test substance is added from a stock solution as described in paragraphs 16, 20 and 21. At least two different concentrations of test substance differing by a factor of 5 to 10 should be used in order to determine degradation kinetics and calculate the kinetic degradation rate constant. Both of the selected concentrations should be less than 100 $\mu\text{g/l}$ and preferably in the range of <1-10 $\mu\text{g/l}$.

26. Close the flasks with stoppers or lids impermeable to air and CO_2 . For non- ^{14}C -labelled non-volatile test chemicals, loose cotton wool plugs that prevent contamination from air are suitable (see paragraph 15) provided that any major degradation products are known to be non-volatile, and if indirect CO_2 determination is used (see Annex 4). ~~Place the flask on a shaking table (approx. 100 rpm agitation) or use magnetic stirring. Agitation must be continuous and sufficient to maintain a homogeneous suspension.~~

27. Incubate the flasks at the selected temperature (see paragraph 22). Withdraw samples for chemical analysis or ^{14}C measurements at the beginning of the test (i.e. before biodegradation starts; see paragraph 12) and then at suitable time intervals during the course of the test. Sampling may be performed by withdrawal of subsamples (e.g. 5-ml aliquots) from each replicate or by harvest of whole flasks at each sampling time. The mineralisation of the test substance may either be determined indirectly or directly (see Annex 4). Usually, a minimum of five sampling points are required during the degradation phase (i.e. after ended lag phase) in order to estimate a reliable rate constant, unless it can be justified that three sampling points are sufficient for rapidly degradable substances. For substances that are not rapidly degraded more measurements during the degradation phase can easily be made and, therefore, more data points should be used for the estimation of k. No fixed time schedule for sampling can be stated, as the rate of biodegradation varies; however the recommendation is to sample once a week if degradation is slow. If the test substance is rapidly degradable, sampling should take place once a day during the first three days and then every second or third day. Under certain circumstances, such as with very rapidly hydrolyzing substances, substances, it may be necessary to sample at hourly intervals. If samples have to be available for further specific analysis, it is advisable to take more samples and then select those to be analysed at the end of the experiment following a backwards strategy, i.e. the last samples are analysed first (see paragraph 38 for guidance on stability of samples during storage).

Number of flasks and samples

28. Set up a sufficient number of test flasks to have:

- test flasks; at least duplicate flasks for each concentration of test substance or multiple test flask for each concentration, if whole flasks are harvested at each sampling time (symbolised F_T);
- test flasks for mass balance calculation; at least duplicate flasks for each test concentration (symbolised F_M);
- blank control, no test substance; at least one blank test flask containing only the test water (symbolised F_B);
- reference control; duplicate flasks with reference substance (e.g. aniline or sodium benzoate, at 10 $\mu\text{g/l}$) (symbolised F_C). The purpose of the reference control is to confirm a minimum of microbial activity. If convenient, a radiolabelled reference substance may be used, also when the degradation of the test substance is monitored by chemical analyses;
- sterile control (~~optionally~~); one or two flasks containing sterilised test water for examining possible abiotic degradation or other non-biological removal of the test substance (symbolised F_S). The biological activity can be stopped by autoclaving (121°C; 20 min) the test water or by adding a toxicant (e.g. sodium azide (NaN_3) at 10-20 g/l, mercuric chloride (HgCl_2) at 100 mg/l or formalin at 100 mg/l) or by gamma irradiation. If HgCl_2 is used, it should be disposed of as toxic waste. For water with sediment added in large amount, sterile conditions are not easy to obtain; in this case repeated autoclaving (e.g., three times) is recommended. It should be considered that the sorption characteristics of the sediment may be altered by autoclaving.
- solvent controls, containing test water and test water with reference substance; duplicate flasks treated with the same amount of solvent and by use of the same procedure as that used for application of the test substance. The purpose is to examine possible adverse effects of the solvent by determining the degradation of the reference substance.

29. The exact number of flasks required will depend on the method used for measuring the degradation (see also paragraphs 32-36 and Annex 4).

30. Two subsamples (e.g. 5-ml aliquots) should be withdrawn from each test flask at each sampling time. If multiple flasks are used to allow harvesting of whole flasks, a minimum of two flasks should be sacrificed at each sampling time (see paragraph 25).

Preparation of flasks for suspended sediment test [optional]

31. Add the necessary volumes of test water and sediment, if required, to the test vessels (see paragraph 18). The preparation of flasks for suspended sediment test is the same as for the pelagic test (see paragraphs 25-29). Use preferably serum bottles or similar shaped flasks. Place the closed flasks horizontally on a shaker. Obviously, open flasks for non- ^{14}C -labelled, non-volatile substances should be placed in upright position; in this case magnetic stirring and the use of magnetic bars coated with glass are recommended. If necessary, aerate the bottles to maintain proper aerobic conditions.

Radiochemical determinations

32. The evolved $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ is measured indirectly and directly (see Annex 4). The $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ is determined indirectly by the difference between the initial ^{14}C activity in the test water or suspension and the total residual activity at the sampling time as measured after acidifying the sample to pH 2-3 and stripping off CO_2 . Inorganic carbon is thus removed and the residual activity measured derives from organic material.

The indirect $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ determination should not be used, if major volatile transformation products are formed during the transformation of the test substance (see Annex 4). If possible, the $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ evolution should be measured directly (see Annex 4) at each sampling time in at least one test flask; this procedure enables both the mass balance and biodegradation process to be checked, but it is restricted to tests conducted with closed flasks.

33. If the evolved $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ is measured directly during the test, more flasks should be set up for this purpose at the start of the test. Direct $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ determination is recommended, if major volatile transformation products are formed during the transformation of the test substance. At each measuring point the additional test flasks are acidified to pH 2-3 and the $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ is collected in an internal or external absorber (see Annex 4).

34. Optionally the concentrations of ^{14}C -labelled test substance and major transformation products may be determined by use of radiochromatography (e.g. thin layer chromatography, TLC) or HPLC with radiochemical detection.

35. Optionally the phase distribution of the remaining radioactivity may be determined (see Annex 2).

36. At the end of the test the mass balance should be determined by direct $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurement using separate test flasks from which no samples are taken in the course of the test (see Annex 4).

Specific chemical analysis

37. If a sensitive specific analytical method is available, primary biodegradation can be assessed by measuring the total residual concentration of test substance instead of using radiolabelling techniques. If a radiolabelled test substance is used (to measure total mineralisation), specific chemical analyses can be made in parallel to provide useful additional information and check the procedure. Specific chemical analyses may also be used to measure transformation products formed during the degradation of the test substance, and this is recommended for substances that are mineralised with half-lives exceeding 60 days. The concentration of the test substance and the transformation products at every sampling time should be measured and reported (as a concentration and as percentage of applied). In general, transformation products detected at $\geq 10\%$ of the applied concentration at any sampling time should be identified unless reasonably justified otherwise. Transformation products for which concentrations are continuously increasing during the study should also be considered for identification, even if their concentrations do not exceed the limit given above, as this may indicate persistence. Analyses of transformation products in sterile controls should be considered, if rapid abiotic transformation of the test substance (e.g. hydrolysis) is thought possible. The need for quantification and identification of transformation products is area-should be considered on a case by case basis, with justifications being provided in the report. Extraction techniques with organic solvent should be applied according to directions given in the respective analytical procedure.

38. All samples should be stored at 2 to 4°C and air-tight if analysis is carried out within 24 hours (preferred). For longer storage, the samples should be frozen below -18°C or chemically preserved. Acidification is not a recommended method to preserve the samples, because acidified samples may be unstable. If the samples are not analysed within 24 hours and are subject to longer storage, a storage stability study should be conducted to demonstrate the stability of chemicals of interest under -18°C storage or preserved conditions. If the analytical method involves either solvent extraction or solid phase extraction (SPE), the extraction should be performed immediately after sampling or after storing the sample refrigerated for a maximum of 24 hours.

39. Depending on the sensitivity of the analytical method larger sample volumes than those indicated in paragraph 15 may be necessary. The test can easily be carried out with test volumes of one litre in flasks of 2-3-litre volume, which makes it possible to collect samples of approx. 100 ml.

DATA AND REPORTING

Treatment of results

Plot of data

40. Round off sampling times to a whole number of hours (unless the substance degrades substantially in a matter of minutes to hours) but not to a whole number of days. Plot the estimates of the residual activity of test substance (for ^{14}C -labelled substances) or the residual concentration (for non-labelled substances), against time both in a linear and in a semi-logarithmic plot (see Figures 1a, 1b). If degradation has taken place and sterile controls have been included (see paragraph 28), compare the results from flasks F_T with those from flasks F_S . If the means of the results from the flasks with test substance (F_T) and the sterile flasks (F_S) deviate by less than 10% are identical, it can be assumed that the degradation observed is predominantly abiotic. If the degradation in flasks F_S is lower, the figures may be used to correct those obtained with flasks F_T (by subtraction) in order to estimate the extent of biodegradation.

41. Estimate the lag phase duration t_L from the degradation curve (semi-logarithmic plot) by extrapolating its linear part to zero degradation or alternatively by determining the time for approximately 10% degradation (see Figures 1a and 1b). From the semi-logarithmic plot, estimate the first order rate constant, k , and its standard error by linear regression of \ln (residual ^{14}C activity or test substance concentration) versus time. With ^{14}C measurements in particular ~~As far as possible~~, use only data belonging to the initial linear part of the curve after the ended lag phase, and give preference to selecting few and representative data rather than selecting a greater number of more uncertain data. Uncertainty includes here errors inherent in the recommended direct use of measured residual ^{14}C activities (see below). It may sometimes be relevant to calculate two different rate constants, if the degradation follows a biphasic pattern. For this purpose two different phases of the degradation curve are defined. The calculations of the rate constant, k , and the half-life $t_{1/2} = \ln 2/k$, should be carried out for each of the individual replicate flasks, when more subsamples are withdrawn from the same flask, or by using the average values, when whole flasks are harvested at each sampling time (see paragraph 30). When the first-mentioned procedure is used, the rate constant and half-life should reported for each of the individual replicate flasks and as an average value with a standard error. If high concentrations of test substance have been used, the degradation curve may deviate considerably from a straight line (semi-logarithmic plot) and first order kinetics may not be valid. Defining a half-life has therefore no meaning. However, for a limited data range, pseudo first order kinetics can be applied and the degradation half-time DT_{50} (time to reach 50% degradation) estimated. It must be borne in mind, however, that the time course of degradation beyond the selected data range cannot be predicted using the DT_{50} which is merely a descriptor of a given set of data. Analytical tools to facilitate statistical calculations and curve fitting are easily available and the use of this kind of software is recommended.

42. If specific chemical analyses are made, estimate rate constants and half-lives for primary degradation as above for total mineralisation. If the primary degradation is the limiting process data points from the entire course of degradation may sometimes be used. This is because measurements are direct by contrast to measurements of ^{14}C activity.

43. If ^{14}C -labelled substances are used, a mass balance should be expressed in percentage of the applied initial concentration, at least at the end of the test.

Residual activity

44. When the ^{14}C -labelled part of an organic substance is biodegraded, the major part of the ^{14}C is converted to $^{14}\text{CO}_2$, while another part is used for growth of biomass and/or synthesis of extra-cellular metabolites. Therefore, complete "ultimate" biodegradation of a substance does not result in a 100% conversion of its carbon into $^{14}\text{CO}_2$. The ^{14}C built into products formed by biosynthesis is subsequently released slowly as $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ due to "secondary mineralisation". For these reasons plots of residual organic ^{14}C activity (measured after stripping off CO_2) or of $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ produced versus time will show a "tailing" after degradation has been completed. This complicates a kinetic interpretation of the data and for this purpose, only the initial part of the curve (after ended lag phase and before approx. 50% degradation is reached) should normally be used for the estimation of a degradation rate constant. If the test substance is degraded, the total residual organic ^{14}C activity is always higher than the ^{14}C activity associated with the remaining intact test substance. If the test substance is degraded by a first order reaction and a constant fraction α is mineralised into CO_2 , the initial slope of the ^{14}C disappearance curve (total organic ^{14}C versus time) will be α times the slope of the corresponding curve for the concentration of test substance (or, to be precise, the part of the test substance labelled with ^{14}C). Using measurements of the total organic ^{14}C activity uncorrected, the calculated degradation rate constant will therefore be conservative. Procedures for estimating the concentrations of the test substance from the measured radiochemical activities based on various simplifying assumptions have been described in the literature (1)(8)(9)(10). Such procedures are most easily applied for rapidly degradable substances.

Interpretation of results

45. If k is found to be independent of the added concentration (i.e. if the calculated k is approximately the same at the different concentrations of test substance), it can be assumed that the first order rate constant is representative of the testing conditions used, i.e. the test substance, the water sample and the test temperature. To what extent the results can be generalised or extrapolated to other systems must be evaluated by expert judgement. If a high concentration of test substance is used, and the degradation therefore does not follow first order kinetics, the data cannot be used for direct estimation of a first order rate constant or a corresponding half-life. However, data derived from a test using a high concentration of test substance may still be usable for estimating the degree of total mineralisation and/or detection and quantification of transformation products.

46. The indirect and direct determination of $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ (paragraphs 32-36 and Annex 4) can only be used to measure the extent of mineralisation of the test substance to CO_2 . Radiochromatography (RAD-TLC) or HPLC may be used to analyse the concentrations of ^{14}C -labelled test substance and the formation of major transformation products (paragraph 34). To enable a direct estimation of the half-life, it is necessary that no major transformation products (defined as $\geq 10\%$ of the applied amount of test substance) should be present for a direct estimation of the half-life of the test substance. In such cases, if major transformation products as defined here are present, a detailed evaluation of the data is required, which. This may include repeated testing and/or identification of the transformation products (see paragraph 37) unless the fate of the transformation products can be reasonably assessed by use of experience (e.g. information on degradation pathway). As the proportion of test substance carbon converted to CO_2 varies (depending largely on the concentration of test substance and other substrates available, the test conditions and the microbial community), this test does not allow a straightforward estimation of ultimate biodegradation as in a DOC die-away test; but the result is similar to that obtained with a respirometric test. The degree of mineralisation will thus be less than or equal to the minimum level of ultimate biodegradation. To obtain a more complete picture of the ultimate biodegradation (mineralisation and incorporation into biomass), the

analysis of the phase distribution of ^{14}C should be performed at the end of the test (see Annex 2). The ^{14}C in the particulate pool will consist of ^{14}C incorporated into bacterial biomass and ^{14}C sorbed to organic particles.

Validity of the test

47. If the reference substance is not degraded within the expected time interval (for aniline and sodium benzoate, usually less than two weeks), the validity of the test is suspected and must be further verified, or alternatively the test should be repeated with a new water sample. In an ISO ring-test of the method where seven laboratories located around Europe participated, adapted degradation rate constants for aniline ranged from 0.3 to 1.7 day⁻¹ with an average of 0.8 d⁻¹ at 20°C and a standard error of $\pm 0.4 \text{ d}^{-1}$ ($t_{1/2} = 0.9$ days). Typical lag times were 1 to 7 days. The waters examined were reported to have a bacterial biomass corresponding to 10³ to 10⁴ colony forming units (CFU) per ml. Degradation rates in nutrient-rich Mid-European waters were greater than in Nordic Scandinavian oligotrophic waters, which may be due to the different trophic status or previous exposure to chemical substances.

48. The total recovery at the end of the experiment should be between 90% and 110% for radiolabelled substances and between 70% and 110% for non-labelled substances. However, the indicated ranges should only be interpreted as targets and should not be used as criteria for acceptance of the test.

Test Report

49. The type of study, i.e. pelagic or suspended sediment test, must be clearly stated in the test report, which shall also contain at least the following information:

Test substance and reference substance(s):

- common names, chemical names (recommend IUPAC and/or CAS names), CAS numbers, structural formulas (indicating position of ^{14}C if radiolabelled substance is used) and relevant physico-chemical properties of test and reference substance (see paragraphs 8-11);
- chemical names, CAS numbers, structural formulas (indicating position of ^{14}C if radiolabelled substance is used) and relevant physico-chemical properties of substances used as standards for identification and quantification of transformation products;
- purity (impurities) of test and reference substances;
- radiochemical purity of labelled chemical and specific activity (where appropriate).

Surface water:

The following minimum information for the water sample taken must be provided:

- location and description of sampling site including, if possible, contamination history ~~and nutrient status~~;
- date and time of sample collection;
- nutrients (total N, ammonium, nitrite, nitrate, total P, dissolved orthophosphate);
- depth of collection;
- appearance of sample (e.g. colour and turbidity);
- DOC and TOC;
- BOD;
- temperature and pH at the place and time of collection;
- oxygen or redox potential (mandatory only if aerobic conditions are not obvious);

- salinity or conductivity (in the case of sea water and brackish water);
- suspended solids (in case of a turbid sample);
- possibly other relevant information about the sampling location at the time of sampling (e.g. actual or historical data on flow rate of rivers or marine currents, nearby major discharges and type of discharges, weather conditions preceding the sampling time).

and optionally:

- ~~BOD;~~
- microbial biomass (e.g. acridine orange direct count or colony forming units);
- inorganic carbon;
- chlorophyll-a concentration as a specific estimate for algal biomass;
- ~~nutrients (total, ammonium, nitrite, nitrate, total P, dissolved orthophosphate).~~

In addition, the following information of the sediment should be provided if the suspended sediment test is conducted:

- depth of sediment collection;
- appearance of the sediment (such as coloured, muddy, silty, or sandy);
- texture (e.g. % coarse sand, fine sand, silt and clay)
- dry weight in g/l of the suspended solids, TOC concentration or weight loss on ignition as a measure of the content of organic matter;
- pH.

Periodic measurements of oxygen concentration or redox potential in water and sediment must be conducted to demonstrate aerobic conditions unless previous experience or other evidence make such measurements unnecessary.

Test conditions:

- delay between collection and use in the laboratory test, sample storage and pre-treatment of the sample dates of performance of the studies;
- amount of test substance applied, test concentration and reference substance;
- method of application of the test substance including any use of solvents;
- volume of surface water used and sediment (if used) and volume sampled at each interval for analysis;
- description of the test system used;
- if dark conditions are not to be maintained, information on the “diffuse light” conditions;
- information on the method(s) used for establishing sterile controls (e.g. temperature, time and number of autoclavings);
- incubation temperature;
- information on analytical techniques and the method(s) used for radiochemical measurements and for mass balance check and measurements of phase distribution (if conducted).
- number of replicates;

Results:

- percentages of recovery (see paragraph 12);
- repeatability and sensitivity of the analytical methods used including the limit level of detection (LOD) and the limit of quantification (LOQ) (see paragraphs 13 and 14);

- all measured data (including sampling time points) and calculated values in tabular form and the degradation curves; for each test concentration and for each replicate flask, report the linear correlation coefficient for the slope of the logarithmic plot, the estimated lag phase and a first-order or pseudo-first order rate constant (if possible), and the corresponding degradation half-life (or the half-life period, t_{50});
- report relevant values as the averages of the results observed in individual replicates, e.g. length of lag phase, degradation rate constant and degradation half-life (or t_{50});
- categorise the system as either non-adapted or adapted as judged from the appearance of the degradation curve and from the possible influence of the test concentration;
- the results of the final mass balance check and results on phase distribution measurements (if any);
- the fraction of ^{14}C mineralised and, if specific analyses are used, the final level of primary degradation;
- the identification, molar concentration and percentage of applied of major transformation products (see paragraph 37), where appropriate;
- a proposed pathway of transformation, where appropriate;
- discussion of results.

LITERATURE

- (1) ISO/DIS 14592-1 (1999) Water quality - Evaluation of the aerobic biodegradability of organic compounds at low concentrations - Part 1: Shake flask batch test with surface water or surface water/sediment suspensions.
- (2) OECD draft (1999). Guidelines for testing of chemicals. Aerobic and anaerobic transformation in aquatic sediment. OECD, Paris.
- (3) OECD draft (1999). Guidelines for the testing of chemicals. Aerobic and anaerobic transformation in soil. OECD, Paris.
- (4) OECD (1993). Guidelines for the Testing of Chemicals. OECD, Paris.
- (5) ISO 8245 (1999). Water quality – Guidelines on the determination of total organic carbon (TOC) and dissolved organic carbon (DOC).
- (6) ISO 10634 (1995). Water quality – Guidance for the preparation and treatment of poorly water-soluble organic compounds for the subsequent evaluation of their biodegradability in an aqueous medium.
- (7) OECD draft (2000). Guidance Document on aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances and mixtures. Environmental Health and Safety Publications. Series on Testing and Assessment. No 22 (to be published summer 2000).
- (8) Simkins, S. and Alexander, M. (1984). Models for mineralisation kinetics with the variables of substrate concentration and population density. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* 47, 394-401.
- (9) Ingerslev, F. and N. Nyholm. (2000). Shake-flask test for determination of biodegradation rates of ^{14}C -labeled chemicals at low concentrations in surface water systems. *Ecotoxicol. Environ. Saf.* 45, 274-283.

(10) ISO/CD 14592-1 (1999). Ring test report: Water Quality – Evaluation of the aerobic biodegradability of organic compounds at low concentrations part 1 – report of 1998/1999 ring-test. Shake flask batch test with surface water or surface water/sediment suspensions.

ANNEX 1DEFINITIONS AND UNITS**Primary biodegradation**

The structural change (transformation) of a chemical substance by microorganisms resulting in the loss of chemical identity.

Functional biodegradation

The structural change (transformation) of a chemical substance by microorganisms resulting in the loss of a specific property.

Ultimate aerobic biodegradation

The breakdown of a chemical substance by microorganisms in the presence of oxygen to carbon dioxide, water and mineral salts of any other elements present (mineralisation) and the production of new biomass and organic microbial biosynthesis products.

Mineralisation

The breakdown of a chemical substance or organic matter by microorganisms in the presence of oxygen to carbon dioxide, water and mineral salts of any other elements present.

Lag phase

The time from the start of a test until adaptation of the degrading micro-organisms is achieved and the biodegradation degree of a chemical substance or organic matter has increased to a detectable level (e.g. 10 % of the maximum theoretical biodegradation, or lower, dependent on the accuracy of the measuring technique).

Maximum level of biodegradation

The degree of biodegradation of a chemical substance or organic matter in a test, recorded in per cent, above which no further biodegradation takes place during the test.

Primary substrate

A collection of natural carbon and energy sources that provide growth and maintenance of the microbial biomass.

Secondary substrate

A substrate component present in a such low concentration, that by its degradation, only insignificant amounts of carbon and energy are supplied to the competent micro-organisms, as compared to the carbon and energy supplied by their degradation of main substrate components (primary substrates).

Degradation rate constant

A first order or pseudo first order kinetic rate constant, k (d^{-1}), which indicates the rate of degradation processes. For a batch experiment k is estimated from the initial part of the degradation curve obtained after the end of the lag phase.

Half-life, $t_{1/2}$ (d)

Term used to characterize the rate of a first order reaction. It is the time interval that corresponds to a concentration decrease by a factor 2. The half-life and the degradation rate constant are related by the equation $t_{1/2} = \ln 2/k$.

Degradation half time, DT_{50} (d)~~Half-life period, t_{50} (d)~~

Term used to quantify the outcome of biodegradation tests. It is the time interval, including the lag phase, needed to reach a value of 50% biodegradation.

Limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantification (LOQ)

The limit of detection (LOD) is the concentration of a substance below which the identity of the substance cannot be distinguished from analytical artefacts. The limit of quantification (LOQ) is the concentration of a substance below which the concentration cannot be determined with an acceptable accuracy.

Dissolved organic carbon (DOC)

That part of the organic carbon in a sample of water which cannot be removed by specified phase separation, for example by centrifugation at 40000 ms^{-2} for 15 min or by membrane filtration using membranes with pores of $0.2 \mu\text{m} - 0.45 \mu\text{m}$ diameter.

Total organic ^{14}C activity (TOA)

The total ^{14}C activity associated with organic carbon.

Dissolved organic ^{14}C activity (DOA)

The total ^{14}C activity associated with dissolved organic carbon.

Particulate organic ^{14}C activity (POA)

The total ^{14}C activity associated with particulate organic carbon.

ANNEX 2PHASE DISTRIBUTION OF ¹⁴C

In order to check the procedure, the routine measurements of residual total organic ¹⁴C activity (TOA) should be supplemented by mass balance measurements involving a direct determination of the evolved ¹⁴CO₂ after trapping in an absorber (see ANNEX 4). In itself, a positive ¹⁴CO₂ formation is a direct evidence of biodegradation as opposed to abiotic degradation or other loss mechanisms, such as volatilisation and sorption. Additional useful information characterising the biodegradability behaviour can be obtained from measurements of the distribution of TOA between the dissolved state (dissolved organic ¹⁴C activity, DOA) and the particulate state (particulate organic ¹⁴C activity, POA) after separation of particulate by membrane filtration or centrifugation. POA consists of test substance sorbed onto the microbial biomass and onto other particulates in addition to the test substance carbon that has been used for synthesis of new cellular material and thereby incorporated into the particulate biomass fraction. The formation of dissolved ¹⁴C organic material can be estimated as the DOA at the end of biodegradation (plateau on the degradation versus time curve).

Estimate the phase distribution of residual ¹⁴C in selected samples by filtering samples on a 0.22 µm or 0.45 µm membrane filter of a material that does not adsorb significant amounts of the test substance (polycarbonate filters may be suitable). If sorption of test substance onto the filter is too large to be ignored (to be checked prior to the experiment) high-speed centrifugation (2,000 g; 10 min) can be used instead of filtration.

Proceed with the filtrate or centrifugate as described in ANNEX 4 for unfiltered samples. Dissolve membrane filters in a suitable scintillation fluid and count as usually, normally using only the external standard ratio method to correct for quenching, or use a sample oxidizer. If centrifugation has been used, re-suspend the pellet formed of the particulate fraction in 1-2 ml of distilled water and transfer to a scintillation vial. Wash subsequently twice with 1 ml distilled water and transfer the washing water to the vial. If necessary, the suspension can be embedded in a gel for liquid scintillation counting.

ANNEX 3

SEMI-CONTINUOUS PROCEDURE

Prolonged incubation for up to several months may be required in order to achieve a sufficient degradation of recalcitrant substances. The duration of the test should normally not exceed 60 days unless the characteristics of the original water sample are maintained by renewal of the test suspension. However, the test period may be extended to a maximum of 90 days without renewal of the test suspension, if the degradation of the test substance has started within the first 60 days.

During incubation for long periods, the diversity of the microbial community may be reduced due to various loss mechanisms and due to possible depletion of the water sample of essential nutrients and primary carbon substrates. It is therefore recommended that a semi-continuous test is used to adequately determine the degradation rate of slowly degrading substances. The test should be initiated by use of the semi-continuous procedure if, based on previous experience, an incubation period of three months is expected to be necessary to achieve 20% degradation of the substance. Alternatively, the normal batch test may be changed into a semi-continuous test, if no degradation of the test substance has been achieved during approximately 60 days of testing using the batch procedure. The semi-continuous procedure may be stopped and the test continued as a batch experiment, when a substantial degradation has been recorded (e.g. >20%).

In the semi-continuous test one third of the test suspension is replaced by fresh water amended with test material at the same concentration as the initial concentration at 2-week intervals. This water should be freshly collected from the same site as the original sample and amended with test substance at the same concentration as the initial concentration. This addition of test substance implies that the initial concentration of test substance is not exceeded by the renewal of the test suspension and, hence, the adaptation, which is frequently seen with high concentrations of a test substance, is avoided. As the procedure comprises both a re-inoculation and a compensation of depleted nutrients and primary substrates, the original microbial diversity is restored, and the duration of the test can be extended to infinity in principle. When the semi-continuous procedure is used, it is important to note that the residual concentration of the test substance must be corrected for the amounts of test substance added and removed at each renewal procedure.

ANNEX 4**DETERMINATION OF $^{14}\text{CO}_2$** **Indirect $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ determination**

For routine measurements, the indirect method is normally the least time-consuming and most precise method if the test substance is non-volatile and is not transformed into volatile transformation products. Simply transfer unfiltered samples e.g. 5-ml size to scintillation vials. A suitable activity in samples is 5,000 dpm - 10,000 dpm (80-170 Bq) initially, and a minimum initial activity is about 1000 dpm. The CO_2 should be stripped off after acidifying to pH 2-3 with 1-2 drops of concentrated H_3PO_4 or HCl . The CO_2 stripping can be performed by bubbling with air for about $\frac{1}{2}$ -1 hour. Alternatively, vials can be shaken vigorously for 1-2 hours (for instance on a microplate shaker) or with more gentle shaking be left overnight. The efficiency of the CO_2 stripping procedure must be checked (by prolonging the aeration or shaking period). A scintillation liquid, suitable for counting aqueous samples should then be added, the sample homogenised on a whirling mixer and the radioactivity determined by liquid scintillation counting, subtracting the background activity found in the test blanks (F_B). Unless the test water is very coloured or contains a high concentration of particles, the samples will normally show uniform quenching and it will be sufficient to perform quench corrections using an external standard. If the test water is highly coloured, quench correction by means of internal standard addition may be necessary. If the concentration of particles is high it may not be possible to obtain a homogeneous solution or gel, or the quench variation between samples may be large. In that case the counting method described below for test slurries can be used. If the test is carried out as a suspended sediment test, the $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ measurement could be done indirectly by taking a homogeneous 10-ml sample of the test water/suspension and separating the phases by centrifugation at a suitable speed (e.g. at 40,000 m/s^2 for 15 min). The aqueous phase should then be then treated as described above. The ^{14}C activity in the particulate phase (POA) should be determined by re-suspending the sediment into a small volume of distilled water, transferring to scintillation vials, and adding scintillation liquid to form a gel (special scintillation liquids are available for that purpose). Depending on the nature of particles (e.g. their content of organic material), it may be feasible to digest the sample overnight with a tissue solubiliser and then homogenise on a whirling mixer prior to the addition of scintillation liquid. Alternatively, the POA can be determined by combustion in excess of oxygen by use of a sample oxidizer. When counting, internal standards should always be included, and it may be necessary to perform quench corrections using internal standard addition for each individual sample.

Direct $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ determination

If the evolved $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ is measured directly, it should be done by setting up more flasks at the start of the test, harvesting the test flasks at each measuring point by acidifying the test flasks to pH 2-3 and collecting the $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ in an internal (placed in each test flask at the start of the test) or external absorber. As absorbing medium either alkali (e.g. 1 N NaOH solution, or a NaOH pellet), ethanolamine or an ethanolamine-based, and commercially available absorbers can be used. For direct measurement of the $^{14}\text{CO}_2$, the flasks should be closed with e.g. butyl rubber septa.




Figure 1a. Example of arithmetic plot of data (residual activity versus time)




Figure 1b. Example of semi-logarithmic plot of data (ln to residual activity versus time).