## **CONFIDENTIAL** 1 (5)



Helsinki, 30 March 2016

Addressee:

Decision number: TPE-D-2114321088-55-01/F

Substance name: Reaction product with n-butanol of high-boiling stream resulting from the hydroxylation, oxidative cleavage and hydrolysis of vegetable oil saturated and unsaturated

C16-C22 triglycerides
EC number: 940-822-5
CAS number: NS
Registration number:
Submission number:

Submission date: 17.04.2015

DECISION ON A TESTING PROPOSAL

Based on Article 40 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (the 'REACH Regulation'), ECHA has taken the following decision.

Your testing proposal is accepted and you are requested to carry out:

1. Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex IX, Section 9.1.5.; test method: Daphnia magna reproduction test, EU C.20./OECD TG 211) using the registered substance.

You may adapt the testing requested above according to the specific rules outlined in Annexes VI to X and/or according to the general rules contained in Annex XI of the REACH Regulation. In order to ensure compliance with the respective information requirement, any such adaptation will need to have a scientific justification, referring and conforming to the appropriate rules in the respective Annex, and an adequate and reliable documentation.

You are required to submit the requested information in an updated registration dossier by **6 April 2017**. You shall also update the chemical safety report, where relevant.

The reasons of this decision are set out in Appendix 1. The procedural history is described in Appendix 2. Advice and further observations are provided in Appendix 3.

# **Appeal**

This decision can be appealed to the Board of Appeal of ECHA within three months of its notification. An appeal, together with the grounds thereof, shall be submitted to ECHA in writing. An appeal has suspensive effect and is subject to a fee. Further details are described under http://echa.europa.eu/web/quest/regulations/appeals.]

Authorised<sup>[2]</sup> by Claudio Carlon, Head of Unit, Evaluation E2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> As this is an electronic document, it is not physically signed. This communication has been approved according to ECHA's internal decision-approval process.



#### **Appendix 1: Reasons**

The decision of ECHA is based on the examination of the testing proposal(s) submitted by you.

# 1. Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex IX, Section 9.1.5.)

Pursuant to Article 40(3)(a) of the REACH Regulation, ECHA may require the Registrant to carry out the proposed test.

"Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates" is a standard information requirement as laid down in Annex IX, Section 9.1.5. of the REACH Regulation. The information on this endpoint is not available for the registered substance but needs to be present in the technical dossier to meet the information requirements. Consequently, there is an information gap and it is necessary to provide information for this endpoint.

You have submitted a testing proposal for testing the registered substance for long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates *Daphnia magna* reproduction test, EU C.20/OECD TG 211 with the following justification: "In accordance with REACH Annex VII column 2, an acute toxicity study in Daphnia does not need to be conducted if the substance is highly insoluble in water. FAV-ES is highly insoluble in water, as indicated in IUCLID section 4.8 on water solubility. Instead, for a substance that is poorly water soluble long-term toxicity testing is more appropriate. The complex composition of the UVCB substance, and the low water solubility of many/all of the constituents will need to be taken into account during the test design phase". ECHA considers that the proposed study is appropriate to fulfil the information requirement of Annex IX, Section 9.1.5 of the REACH Regulation.

According to ECHA *Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment* (version 2.0, November 2014), Chapter R7b (Section R.7.8.5 including Figure R.7.8-4), if based on acute aquatic toxicity data neither fish nor invertebrates are shown to be substantially more sensitive, long-term studies may be required on both. There were no indications in the dossier from the short-term toxicity data on aquatic species that the fish would be substantially more sensitive than aquatic invertebrates. In such case, according to the integrated testing strategy, the *Daphnia* study is to be conducted first. If based on the results of the long-term *Daphnia* study and the application of a relevant assessment factor no risks are observed (PEC/PNEC<1), no long-term fish testing may need to be conducted. However, if a risk is indicated, long-term fish testing may need to be conducted.

Therefore, pursuant to Article 40(3)(a) of the REACH Regulation, you are requested to carry out the proposed test using the registered substance subject to the present decision: Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (test method: *Daphnia magna* reproduction test, EU C.20/OECD TG 211).

## **CONFIDENTIAL** 3 (5)



#### Notes for your consideration

Once results of the proposed test on long-term toxicity to aquatic invertebrates are available, you shall revise the chemical safety assessment as necessary according to Annex I of the REACH Regulation. If the revised chemical safety assessment indicates the need to investigate further the effects on aquatic organisms, you shall submit a testing proposal for a long-term toxicity test on fish in order to fulfil the standard information requirement of Annex IX, 9.1.6. If you come to the conclusion that no further investigation of effects on aquatic organisms is required, you shall update your technical dossier by clearly stating the reasons for adapting the standard information requirement of Annex IX, 9.1.6.

Due to the low solubility in water and the complex composition of this UVCB substance OECD Guidance Document on Aquatic Toxicity Testing of Difficult Substances and Mixtures, ENV/JM/MONO (2000)6 and ECHA Guidance, Chapter R7b, table R. 7.8-3 summarising aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances should be consulted by the Registrant for choosing the design of the requested long-term ecotoxicity tests and for calculation and expression of the result of this test.

#### **CONFIDENTIAL** 4 (5)



#### **Appendix 2: Procedural history**

ECHA received your registration containing the testing proposal(s) for examination pursuant to Article 40(1) on 17 April 2015.

ECHA notified you of the draft decision on 14 September 2015 and invited you to provide comments. ECHA took into account your comments, which were sent within the commenting period, and they are reflected in the Reasons (Appendix 1).

This decision does not take into account any updates after 20 November 2015, 30 calendar days after the end of the commenting period.

The decision making followed the procedure of Articles 50 and 51 of the REACH Regulation:

ECHA notified the draft decision to the competent authorities of the Member States for proposal(s) for amendment(s).

As no amendments were proposed, ECHA took the decision according to Article 51(3) of the REACH Regulation.



## Appendix 3: Further information, observations and technical guidance

- 1. This decision does not imply that the information provided by the Registrant in his registration dossier is in compliance with the REACH requirements. The decision does not prevent ECHA from initiating a compliance check on the registration at a later stage.
- 2. Failure to comply with the request(s) in this decision, or to fulfil otherwise the information requirement(s) with a valid and documented adaptation, will result in a notification to the Enforcement Authorities of the Member States.
- 3. In carrying out the test(s) required by the present decision it is important to ensure that the particular sample of substance tested is appropriate to assess the properties of the registered substance, taking into account any variation in the composition of the technical grade of the substance as actually manufactured. If the registration of the substance covers different grades, the sample used for the new test(s) must be suitable to assess these. Furthermore, there must be adequate information on substance identity for the sample tested and the grade(s) registered to enable the relevance of the test(s) to be assessed.