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IDENTIFICATION OF A SUBSTANCE OF VERY HIGH CONCERN ON THE BASIS OF THE CRITERIA SET OUT IN REACH ARTICLE 57

**Substance Names:** 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof)

**EC Number:** -

**CAS number:** -

The substances are identified as substances of equivalent level of concern to those of other substances listed in points (a) to (e) of Article 57 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (REACH) according to Article 57(f) of REACH Regulation.

**Summary of how the substance meets the criteria set out in Article 57 of the REACH Regulation**

2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof), further denoted as HFPO-DA, are identified as substances of very high concern in accordance with Article 57(f) of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006 (REACH) because in water under environmental conditions these substances exist in the form of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate, for which there is scientific evidence of probable serious effects to the environment and human health which give rise to an equivalent level of concern to those of other substances listed in points (a) to (e) of Article 57 of REACH.

Several concerns are caused by the intrinsic properties of HFPO-DA. Elements of concern are triggered by individual intrinsic properties or by different combinations of the properties. Overall, HFPO-DA has a very high potential to cause effects in wildlife and in humans exposed via environment, due to its persistence, mobility, potential for long-range transport, observed adverse effects that may be relevant for human health and the environment (at least the following probable effects for human health: effects on the liver, the kidney, the haematological and immune systems and effects on development, and the following effects for the environment: population relevant effects on birds and mammals) and exposure via plants and fish. The very high persistence together with low adsorption potential and mobility imply a high potential for increasing pollution stock in the environment and for irreversible and increasing exposures of both wildlife and humans exposed via the environment. Furthermore, the low adsorption potential and high water solubility leads to difficulty in removing HFPO-DA using end-of-pipe treatment and means that HFPO-DA is fully bioavailable for uptake via water. Together, these elements of concern lead to a very high potential for irreversible effects once effect levels have been reached, as well as an increasing seriousness of effects while exposures keep increasing.

Due to its intrinsic properties the substance also has a very high potential to cause widespread exposures. It is difficult to decontaminate drinking water resources and there is a large variety of exposure routes for intake via food. Therefore, continuous and increasing exposure in human populations cannot be avoided. Similarly, wildlife populations cannot be protected from the total quantity of the substance released. It follows that both environment and humans are susceptible to adverse effects on a global scale. In summary, the elements above provide scientific evidence of serious effects that are probable for human health and the environment.

The level of concern is considered very high due to the combination of:

- the high potential for irreversible exposure due to very high persistence and in the case of human exposures via environment - difficulty to decontaminate drinking water,
• the high potential for increasing contamination and increasing, fully bioavailable exposures as the intrinsic properties cause a difficulty to remove the substance after release,
• the high potential for rapid and wide geographic scale contamination,
• the high potential for causing serious effects even though those would not be observed in standard tests,
• the observed effects in experimental toxicity studies are of such nature that in combination with the above aspects, they lead to a high potential for serious effects on humans and the environment on a global scale,
• potential for inter-generational effects,
• high societal concerns.

The main target organs identified in rodent studies include the liver, the kidney, the haematologic system, and the immune system. The substance is furthermore observed to cross the placenta and to distribute into the foetus, to cause early deliveries, decreased gravid uterine weight, and to result in decreased birth weight in pups. The carcinogenic effects observed in rats are included as supportive information, although the carcinogenic potential of the substance is under investigation. In addition, secondary poisoning is of concern for wildlife. The irreversibility of adverse effects that are normally considered as reversible as a consequence of continuous exposure adds to the concern. Furthermore, it may be difficult in practice to manage exposures due to the high mobility of HFPO-DA and the fact that exposures may take place at a different location than where releases occurred and at a different moment in time. The high persistence and high mobility of HFPO-DA together furthermore lead to a concern for co-exposure with other contaminants with similar health effects. Co-exposure may eventually occur and may last for a very long time, because natural degradation processes for these substances are slow or negligible. This is brought into the weight-of-evidence as supportive information.

Monitoring data show HFPO-DA in surface water, sea water, ground water and drinking water at locations with and without apparent emission sources in the vicinity. HFPO-DA is also found in fish, plants and humans close to known emission sites. This indicates that HFPO-DA can be bioavailable, that it is probable that exposure may occur through the food chain and via drinking water and that this is already taking place at specific locations.

Limitations of the available remediation techniques raise a concern that the removal of HFPO-DA from drinking water may only be possible with high societal costs. Remediation of environmental pollution may be practically impossible due to HFPO-DAs’ high solubility in water, its low adsorption potential and its high mobility. Remediation is also difficult because HFPO-DA will quickly diffuse from contaminated sites.

None of these observations may be of equivalent level of concern in isolation, but in a weight-of-evidence consideration, the above arguments demonstrate that there is scientific evidence of probable serious adverse effects of these substances to the environment and humans, which gives rise to an equivalent level of concern to those of other substances listed in points (a) to (e) of Article 57 of REACH Regulation.

Registration dossiers submitted for the substance: Yes, for ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(hepta fluoropropoxy)propanoate (FRD-902; CAS 62037-80-3).
Justification

1. Identity of the substance and physical and chemical properties

1.1 Name and other identifiers of the substances

This support document applies to 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof). The characteristics of those substances belonging to this group for which there is a registration or preregistration under REACH are summarised below.

First is the registered ammonium salt ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate (FRD-902; CAS 62037-80-3, see Table 1). FRD-902 belongs to the group of perfluorinated substances (PFAS), and is a member of perfluorinated alkyl acids and therein its subgroup of PFECAs (per- and polyfluorooether carboxylic acids). In several of its properties, FRD-902 resembles the properties of other perfluorinated alkyl acids, more in detail, short chain perfluorinated carboxylic acids (PFCAs) and perfluorinated sulfonic acids (PFSAs).

FRD-902 is manufactured by mixing the second substance, FRD-903 (EC 236-236-8; CAS 13252-13-6, see Table 2 and Figure 2), with an ammonium hydroxide solution (Beekman et al., 2016). FRD-903 is not registered under REACH but is manufactured in the US.

Under environmental conditions in a water environment, FRD-902 and FRD-903 dissociate to form HFPO-DA (see Table 5 and Figure 5, and Section 1.4 for further details). HFPO-DA consists of two C3 moieties, with the carboxylic acid on the first carbon atom, and a propoxy (propyl ether) group attached to the second carbon atom of the first C3 moiety. The chemical is perfluorinated, i.e. no hydrogen but only fluoro atoms are attached to the two carbon chains.

In addition to FRD-902 and FRD-903, the ECHA dissemination site makes reference to the preregistered highly similar potassium salt of HFPO-DA (potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate; EC 266-578-3; CAS 67118-55-2, see Table 3 and Figure 3). It is expected that under environmental conditions, this salt will behave in a similar way as FRD-902 and FRD-903.

Currently available information suggests that only one other substance besides the acid (FRD-903), the ammonium (FRD-902) and the potassium salts could lead to HFPO-DA in the environment. This substance is hexafluoropropylene oxide (HFPO). It is used in manufacturing processes of fluoropolymers. HFPO is a well-known versatile synthetic building block in the manufacturing of fluoropolymers (such as polyfluoroalkoxy plastics) as well as a number of poly- and per-fluorinated intermediates. HFPO can react to form the HFPO-dimer acid fluoride, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride acid (EC 218-173-8, see Table 4 and Figure 4) during oligomerisation, or other manufacturing processes (Siegemund, et al. 2012). Acyl halides in general are very reactive towards water (acid catalysed hydrolysis) forming the carboxylic acid (in this case HFPO-DA and a hydrogen halide (hydrogen fluoride) (Hopkins et al 2018). This hydrolysis is the most heavily exploited reaction for acyl halides as it occurs in the industrial synthesis of acetic acid. The strong reactivity with water makes acyl halides in general irritants to the eyes, skin and mucous membranes. Therefore, after release in the environment of the HFPO-dimer via e.g. air, contact with water would readily lead to the formation of the HFPO-dimer acid via hydrolysis. A likely airborne precursor to HFPO-DA is the C3 dimer acid fluoride, which readily hydrolyzes to form deprotonated HFPO-DA when it comes into contact with water (Oppenheimer et al. 2007). The presence of this HFPO dimer acid (HFPO-DA) in the environment
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could thus also be due to residual leaching from commercial products or direct release during the manufacturing processes that involve HFPO as the building block for fluoropolymer synthesis.

This support document covers 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof). For simplicity, the substances are denoted all together by the abbreviation HFPO-DA in this document, unless specified otherwise.

Table 1: Substance identity FRD-902, registered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EC number:</strong></th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC name:</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS number (in the EC inventory):</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS number:</strong></td>
<td>62037-80-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deleted CAS numbers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS name:</strong></td>
<td>Propanoic acid, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)-, ammonium salt (1:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IUPAC name:</strong></td>
<td>Ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index number in Annex VI of the CLP Regulation:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molecular formula:</strong></td>
<td>C6H4F11NO3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molecular weight range:</strong></td>
<td>347.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synonyms:</strong></td>
<td>• FRD-902 (ammonium salt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GenX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• C3 Dimer salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other synonyms noted in literature are:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cheminox P0-2-AM60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ammonium perfluoro(2-methyl-3-oxahexanoate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the individual isomers of FRD-902 are:

- ammonium (2R)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate; and
- ammonium (2S)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate.

**Structural formula:**

![Chemical structure of ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy) propanoate (FRD-902)](image_url)

**Figure 1:** Chemical structure of ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy) propanoate (FRD-902)
Table 2: Substance identity FRD-903, preregistered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC number:</th>
<th>236-236-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC name:</td>
<td>2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS number (in the EC inventory):</td>
<td>13252-13-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS number: Deleted CAS numbers:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS name:</td>
<td>Propanoic acid, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPAC name:</td>
<td>2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index number in Annex VI of the CLP Regulation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular formula:</td>
<td>C₆H₁₁F₁₁O₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular weight range:</td>
<td>330.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Synonyms:           | • 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid 
• Perfluoro-2-methyl-3-oxahexanoic acid 
• exafluoropropylene oxide dimer acid 
• HFPO-DA 
• HFPO2 
• FRD-903 (acid) 
• Perfluoro-2-propoxypropanoic acid 
• PFPrOPrA 
• Undecafluoro-2-methyl-3-oxahexanoic acid |

Note: the individual isomers of FRD-903 are:
- (2R)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid (CAS number 75579-39-4); and 
- (2S)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid (CAS number 75579-40-7).

Structural formula:

Figure 2: Chemical structure of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid (FRD-903)
Table 3: Substance identity | Potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate, preregistered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EC number:</strong></th>
<th>266-578-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC name:</strong></td>
<td>Potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS number (in the EC inventory):</strong></td>
<td>67118-55-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS number:</strong></td>
<td>Deleted CAS numbers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS name:</strong></td>
<td>Propanoic acid, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)-, potassium salt (1:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IUPAC name:</strong></td>
<td>Potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index number in Annex VI of the CLP Regulation:</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molecular formula:</strong></td>
<td>C₆F₁₁KO₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molecular weight range:</strong></td>
<td>368.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Synonyms:** | • AC1N68UQ  
• SCHEMBL9173907  
• CTK2F3686  
• JEDKCJRGYTGMG-UHFFFAOYSA-M  
• Potassium perfluoro-2-methyl-3-oxahexanoate  
• 2,3,3,3-Tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid potassium salt  
• potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate |

Note: the individual isomers of potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate are:
- potassium (2R)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate; and
- potassium (2S)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate.

**Structural formula:**

![Chemical structure of potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate](image)
Table 4: Substance identity 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride, preregistered with registration deadline 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EC number:</strong></th>
<th>218-173-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EC name:</strong></td>
<td>2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propionyl fluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMILES:</strong></td>
<td>O=C(F)C(F)(OC(F)(F)C(F)(F)F)C(F)(F)F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS number (in the EC inventory):</strong></td>
<td>2062-98-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS number:</strong></td>
<td>2062-98-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAS name:</strong></td>
<td>Propanoyl fluoride, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IUPAC name:</strong></td>
<td>2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Index number in Annex VI of the CLP Regulation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molecular formula:</strong></td>
<td>C₆F₁₂O₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Molecular weight range:</strong></td>
<td>332.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synonyms:</strong></td>
<td>C₃ dimer acid fluoride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the individual isomers of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride are:
- (2R)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride; and
- (2S)-2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride

**Structural formula:**

![Chemical structure of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride](image)

**Figure 4:** Chemical structure of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride

### 1.2 Composition of the substance

This support document applies to 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof). The registered and preregistered substances that are part of this group include:

**Name (1):** Ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate (FRD-902)

**Name (2):** 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid (FRD-903)

**Name (3):** Potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate
**Name(4):** 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride

Under environmental conditions, FRD-902 (ammonium salt), FRD-903 (the acid) and potassium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate and the C3 dimer acid fluoride are present in the anionic form, i.e. HFPO-DA (see Table 5). Therefore, there is no difference in the environmental fate and toxicological properties of these substances (Beekman et al. (2016)).

**Table 5: HFPO-DA, the anion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EC number:</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC name:</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMILES:</td>
<td>FC(F)(C(F)(F)OC(F)(C([O-])=O)C(F)(F)F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS number (in the EC inventory):</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS number:</td>
<td>122499-17-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS name:</td>
<td>Propanoic acid, 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)-, ion(1-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPAC name:</td>
<td>2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index number in Annex VI of the CLP Regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular formula:</td>
<td>C₆F₁₁O₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular weight range:</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonyms:</td>
<td>HFPO-DA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5:** Chemical structure of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate

### 1.3 Identity and composition of structurally related substances (used in a grouping or read-across approach)

Other PFASs of interest for read-across purposes (of which some are also short-chain PFASs) are summarised in Table 6. These are extracted from Zeilmaker et al. (2018), who proposed a model for a combined toxicity assessment through so called relative potency factors (RPFs) based on similar liver effects between the substances (see Section 4 for further details). This list is not exhaustive.
Table 6: PFCAs and PFSAs (listed as acid equivalents) for which Relative Potency Factors have been derived in addition to HFPO-DA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFAS group</th>
<th>PFAS (acid form)</th>
<th>EC number (acid form)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFSA</td>
<td>Perfluorobutanesulfonic acid (PFBS)</td>
<td>206-793-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoropentanesulfonic acid (PFPeS)</td>
<td>220-301-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorohexanesulfonic acid (PFHxS)</td>
<td>206-587-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroheptane sulfonic acid (PFHpS)</td>
<td>206-800-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS)</td>
<td>217-179-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorodecane sulfonic acid (PFDS)</td>
<td>206-401-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCA</td>
<td>Perfluorobutyric acid (PFBA)</td>
<td>206-786-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)</td>
<td>220-300-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA)</td>
<td>206-196-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)</td>
<td>206-798-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)</td>
<td>206-397-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorononanoic acid (PFNA)</td>
<td>206-801-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA)</td>
<td>206-400-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUnDA)</td>
<td>218-165-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorododecanoic acid (PFDoDA)</td>
<td>206-203-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorotridecanoic acid (PFTrDA)</td>
<td>276-745-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorotetradecanoic acid (PFTeDA)</td>
<td>206-803-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorohexadecanoic acid (PFHxDA)</td>
<td>267-638-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroocadecanoic acid (PFODA)</td>
<td>240-582-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Physicochemical properties

Details on the studies described in this section have been obtained from study reports as published on the website Health and Environmental Research Online (HERO) of U.S. EPA on GenX (https://hero.epa.gov/hero/index.cfm/project/page/project_id/2627).

The physicochemical properties of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate have been determined in several tests with different purities and forms of the test substance. The forms most used in these tests were the ammonium salt referred to as the product H-28308 with a purity 86%, further containing 14.58% water and 7.0 ppm PFOA and the acid referred to as the product H-28307 with a purity of 98%, further containing 0.61% water and 8.6 ppm PFOA. Besides that, some tests with the dried ammonium salt are mentioned on ECHA’s dissemination website with a purity of 99.4%.

The vapour pressure was determined in triplicate at a temperature of 20±0.5 °C with the static method according to OECD test guideline 104 with the product H-28308 (also referred to in the report as FRD 902). The vapour pressure at 20°C was 2910±20.8 Pa. The vapour pressure is primarily attributed to the presence of water and ammonia in the test substance (Nixon and Lezotte, 2008c). For this reasons this value is not further considered.

The same test was performed with the product H-28307 (also referred to in the report as FRD 903). The vapour pressure at 20°C was 306±13.7 Pa (Nixon and Lezotte, 2008b). Although not specified in this report, the observed vapour pressure might be affected by the presence of water as well. However, given the low percentage of the impurity this is most likely not explaining the observed vapour pressure.

On ECHA’s dissemination site another value of 0.0117 ± 0.000115 Pa at 20 °C is mentioned for the dried ammonium salt. This value was obtained with the spinning rotor technique according to OECD test guideline 104. No study report is available for this study.

The QSAR program Mpbpwin v1.43 from EPI Suite estimates a vapour pressure of 63.5 Pa at 20 °C (92.1 Pa at 25 °C) for the acid form. For the ammonium form, the estimate is 0.00282 Pa at
20 °C for the solid substance and 0.0347 Pa for the subcooled liquid. HFPO-DA is present in the anionic form in the aquatic environment at environmentally relevant conditions. It is thus considered adequate to use the vapour pressure of the dried substance or to apply a fraction dissociated.

Differences were observed for the ammonium salt (solid: 0.0117 Pa at 20°C) and acid (liquid: 306 Pa at 20°C). However, if the vapour pressure of the acid is multiplied for the undissociated fraction at neutral pH that is available for volatilisation, an almost identical value of 0.021 Pa is obtained (using the pKa of 2.84, see below). Therefore, the value for vapour pressure of the dried ammonium salt is further considered in the assessment.

On the ECHA dissemination website a value for the distribution between octanol and water is presented, which is a log $D_{ow}$ of 2.58 for the ionised form estimated at environmentally relevant pHs. No further information on this value is given. KOWWIN v1.68 from EpiSuite predicts a log $K_{ow}$ of 3.36 for the neutral species of HFPO-DA. In general, KOWWIN makes log P estimates that are "corrected for ionization"; that is, KOWWIN estimates apply to compounds that are predominantly in a non-ionized form. There are exceptions; in particular, estimates for compounds considered "ion pairs" such as sodium salts. By entering the sodium salt of HFPO-DA KOWWIN v1.68 can be made to estimate a log $K_{ow}$ of the (fully) dissociated species: this gives a value of 0.45. The training dataset of KOWWIN contains several (per)fluorinated alkyls and specific correction factors have been introduced for the "linear -CF2- core" and perfluorinated ethers or thio-ethers (-O-CF2-, or -S-CF2-) indicating that these type of substances are part of the training data set. MarvinSketch v16.10.24 estimates a log $K_{ow}$ of 4.00 for the neutral species and a log $D_{ow}$ of 0.47 at neutral pHs. Bioloom v1.5 predicts a log $K_{ow}$ of 4.98, which is also an estimate of the partitioning behaviour of the neutral species. Again, both fluoro- and trifluoromethyl-fragments as well as proximity corrections of fluoro and non-fluoro fragments in the BioLoom estimate indicate that the training data contains (per)fluorinated substances that gave rise to the parameterization of these specific aliphatic fluoro-fragments and correction factors.

Using the following approximate expression to adjust log $K_{ow}$ for ionisation at environmental pHs, valid for monoprotic acids:

$$
\log D_{acids} \approx \log P + \log \left[ \frac{1}{1 + 10^{\rho H - pK_a}} \right],
$$

with the value pKa value of -0.77 and a log $K_{ow}$ of 4 would give a log D of -3.77. However, when applying the relationship using the experimentally determined value for pKa of 2.84 or 3.82 (see below) gives a log D estimation (coming from a log $K_{ow}$ of 4) of -0.16 and 0.82 respectively at pH 7. The MarvinSketch estimate of log D at neutral pH (0.47) fits nicely in between these log D estimates. When using the KOWWIN estimate for log Kow (3.36) these pKa’s would give log D estimates of -0.8 and 0.18. The log D estimates from KOWWIN (0.45) is slightly above this simple correction. Using the higher BioLoom log Kow estimate of log Kow (4.98) would give pH adjusted log D estimates of 0.82 and 1.8 with the two measured pKas respectively. A reasonable value for the log D based on both log Kow estimations as well as pKa measurements seems to be around log D = 0.5 at pH 7.

KOWWIN v1.10 from EpiSuite predicts a logarithm of the partition coefficient between octanol and air (log $K_{oa}$) of 5.44. It must be noted that the relevance of the distribution between octanol and water or air is limited, because HFPO-DA does not primarily partition to lipids or fatty tissues.

The solubility of the product H-28308 (also referred to in the report as FRD 902) with a test substance content of 86% was determined with the shake-flask method at 20±0.5 °C according to OECD test guideline 105 (Nixon and Lezotte, 2008c). Analysis was performed with HPLC-MS. At a measured concentration of 739±13 g/L saturation was still not achieved. Therefore, the substance is considered infinitely soluble in water (Nixon and Lezotte, 2008c). The same test was performed with product H-28307 (also referred to in the report as FRD 903) with a test substance purity of 98%. Saturation was not achieved at a concentration of the product of 756±11.8 g/L. Also in this case the products is considered infinitely soluble in water (Nixon and Lezotte, 2008b).
On the ECHA dissemination website, two values for the solubility of the ammonium salt (82.6% purity) of 218 and 207 mg/L in Haskell well water and in AAP nutrient medium, respectively at 10 °C are reported. These values were determined from the verification by LC-MS of nominal concentrations after an equilibrium time of 25 hours. Because verified analytical concentrations were slightly in excess of the nominal concentrations, also these values seem to be unbounded (greater than) values rather than a fixed value for the aqueous solubility.

The QSAR program WSKOW v1.42 of EpiSuite predicts a solubility of 27.2 mg/L for the acid. However, the reliability of this estimate is limited, because this is based on an estimated value for the log $K_{ow}$. The program WATERNT v1.01 predicts a similar solubility 16.9 mg/L. This program is based on fragment additions for water solubility. It is clear that the QSAR programmes substantially underestimate the experimentally observed solubility. Following the choice on the ECHA dissemination website, 1000 g/L is used in further assessment.

The pKa of both the ammonium salt and the acid have been determined experimentally by the titration method according to OECD test guideline 121 at 20 °C. The pKa of the acid (H-28307) was 2.84 ± 0.021. The pKa of the reference substance benzoic acid was 4.28 (reference value 4.19). The study report (Murrell and Nixon, 2008) contains some results (titration curve), but the result of 2.84 cannot be reproduced from these data. Also for the ammonium salt (H-28308) a pKa value was determined (Nixon and Lezotte, 2008a). The reported pKa value was 3.82 ± 0.0589, which corresponds to a pKb values of 8.10 ± 0.0677. However, it is not clear for which transition this pKa and pKb relate to. In principle, the same pKa value is expected for 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate, and the difference cannot be explained. The reliability of these two pKa values can thus not be sufficiently assigned.

With the QSAR program MarvinSketch v16.10.24, a pKa value of -0.77 is estimated for 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate and 8.86 for ammonium. Although some uncertainties arise from the experimental data, it is clear that at environmentally relevant conditions (ambient temperature, neutral pH) HFPO-DA will be present in the anionic form. The environmental fate and toxicological properties of the ammonium salt and the acid will thus be similar in the end.

2 Harmonised classification and labelling

At present, there is no harmonised classification and labelling in Part 3 of Annex VI of Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008 (CLP Regulation) for 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof).

FRD-902 is self-classified by its REACH Registrant and by 30 additional CLP Notifiers. The 4 joint submissions self-classify FRD-902 as:

- Acute Tox. 4 H302: Harmful if swallowed
- Eye Dam. 1 H318: Causes serious eye damage
- STOT RE 2 H373: May cause damage to organs through prolonged or repeated exposure:
  - for blood = 1 aggregated submission with 27 notifiers,
  - for blood and liver = 2 aggregated submissions and 3 notifiers and
  - for blood (Oral and Inhalation) = 1 aggregated submission with 1 notifier)

One notifier (1 joint submission) additionally self-classifies FRD-902 as:

- Acute Tox. 4 H312: Harmful in contact with skin
- Acute Tox. 4 H332: Harmful if inhaled

FRD-903 is self-classified by 99 CLP Notifiers. One joint submission of 66 Notifiers self-classifies FRD-903 as:

- Acute Tox. 4 H302: Harmful if swallowed

---
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Skin Corr. 1C H314: Causes severe skin burns and eye damage
Eye Dam. 1 H318: Causes serious eye damage
STOT SE 3 H335: May cause Respiratory irritation

One joint submission of 30 notifiers self-classifies FRD-903 as:
- Not classified

One joint submission of 2 notifiers self-classifies FRD-903 as:
- Skin Corr. 1C H314: Causes severe skin burns and eye damage

One joint submission of 1 notifier self-classifies FRD-903 as:
- Skin Corr. 1B H314: Causes severe skin burns and eye damage

2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride is self-classified by 2 notifiers.

One notifier self classifies the substance as:
- Met Corr. 1 H290: May be corrosive for metals
- Skin Corr. 1C: H314: Causes severe skin burns and eye damage
- Eye Dam. 1: H318: Causes serious eye damage

One notifier self classifies the substance as:
- Skin Corr. 1B: H314: Causes severe skin burns and eye damage

3 Environmental fate properties

3.1 Degradation

For HFPO-DA, the dimer acid of HFPO, there are no studies on its degradation potential available that follow a standardised and generally accepted study design, such as the OECD test guidelines. For the ammonium salt of HFPO-DA, ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy) propanoate (CAS 62037-80-3), only information from screening tests on ready biodegradation is available, showing that the substance does not undergo primary or ultimate degradation. Further information is obtained from QSAR estimates and comparisons with structurally related compounds such as PFOA.

The stability of organic fluorine compounds has been described in detail by Siegemund et al. (2012): "When all valences of a carbon chain are satisfied by fluorine, the zigzag-shaped carbon skeleton is twisted out of its plane in the form of a helix. This situation allows the electronegative fluorine substituents to envelope the carbon skeleton completely and shield it from chemical attack. Several other properties of the carbon-fluorine bond contribute to the fact that highly fluorinated alkanes are one of the most stable organic compounds. These include polarisability and high bond energies, which increase with increasing substitution by fluorine. The influence of fluorine is greatest in highly fluorinated and perfluorinated compounds. Properties that are exploited commercially include high thermal and chemical stability”.

A number of studies for PFOA confirm that this substance is very persistent and does not undergo abiotic or biotic degradation at all in studies conducted under environmental conditions (ECHA, 2013b). The persistence of PFOA and its salts was recognised by the Member State Committee that identified the substances as SVHC, among other things, based on its PBT properties (ECHA, 2013a).

Also C9-C14 PFCAs as well as the ammonium and sodium salts of C9-PFCA and C10-PFCA were included on the Candidate List as substances of very high concern (SVHC). All substances meet the P and vP-criteria of REACH Annex XIII based on a weight of evidence approach (ECHA, 2015a, ECHA, 2012d, ECHA, 2012b, ECHA, 2012f, ECHA, 2012e, ECHA, 2012c). The structurally related substance PFHxS also contains this type of a stable fluorinated carbon chain. The conclusion that PFHxS fulfils the criteria for being "very persistent" was adopted by the Member State Committee

---
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in 2017 (ECHA, 2017b).

There are structural similarities between HFPO-DA and PFCAs, such as the high degree of fluorination, the carboxylic acid group, steric conformation, and bond angles (see Annex II). One difference between HFPO-DA and PFCAs is the ether bond in HFPO-DA, which is located between two C3 moieties. Due to the ether bond the fluorinated carbon chains in HFPO-DA are shorter than in e.g. perfluorohexanoic acid (PFHxA) which has the same number of fluorine atoms. The ether bond or the other differences between these compounds are not expected to decrease the persistence or stability of these substances in the environment. QSARs models in BIOWIN v4.10 of EpiSuite include a negative fragment contribution of the aliphatic ether bond on the degradation potential. This indicates that the ether bond in HFPO-DA is not expected to decrease the environmental persistence, although it is neither likely to increase the environmental persistence in comparison to the perfluorinated carboxylic acids, which are already very persistent. BIOWIN results (see section 3.1.2.1.1) suggest that HFPO-DA, PFHxA, and PFOA have a very low biodegradability and that there may be some differences in biodegradability between these compounds. However, the suitability of the BIOWIN models to predict differences between these compounds is questionable, as there are some limitations in these models for the predictions of perfluorinated compounds (see Section 3.1.2.1.1).

For some of the studies, study reports were retrieved from the Health and Environmental Research Online (HERO) website of U.S. EPA on GenX (https://hero.epa.gov/hero/index.cfm/project/page/project_id/2627). All studies and publications are considered relevant to evaluate the degradation of HFPO-DA, and are used in the weight of evidence assessment of persistence. Despite the fact that some studies are not conducted according to OECD guidelines, or may not be considered highly relevant as stand-alone studies to assess the persistence, the study results show an overall consistent pattern of degradation for HFPO-DA. Hence, there is no reason to discard any study on the basis of reliability.

### 3.1.1 Abiotic degradation

#### 3.1.1.1 Hydrolysis

Ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate (test substance H-28308, see Section 1.4) was shown to be hydrolytically stable at pH 4, 7 and 9, with no degradation after 5 days at 50°C in a hydrolysis as a function of pH study according to OECD TG 111. Analysis was performed by HPLC-MS. Recovery of the test substance at test initiation was 105, 105, and 102% at pH 4, 7, and 9, respectively. After 5 days, recoveries were 95.4, 94.5, and 93.5% at pH 4, 7, and 9, respectively. Fortified matrix recoveries, freshly prepared and added to blank media after 5 days were 97.4, 93.1, and 91.7% at pH 4, 7, and 9, respectively. All chromatograms contained only one single peak. From these results, it is concluded that the half-life of the test substance due to hydrolysis at a relevant pH range is over 1 year (van Hoven and Nixon, 2008).

The QSAR model HYDROWIN v2.00 of the EPISuite tool (US EPA, 2002-2012) predicts rates and half-lives for hydrolysis. 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid does not contain any functional groups for which hydrolysis can be estimated by HYDROWIN v2.00.

#### 3.1.1.2 Oxidation and reduction

The oxidation of ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate was tested under laboratory conditions in quartz tubes placed in a photoreactor under ultraviolet light (3.8 μE/L/s at 253.7 nm) with 20 mM persulfate (potassium salt) at a pH of 10. The concentrations of HFPO-DA as well as from the metabolites trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) and pentfluoropropionic acid (PFA) were followed in time by HPLC-MS/MS. This method was shown to be effective to degrade PFOA and other PFCAs. In this study, the degradation of PFOA was also studied. In 180 minutes, 26% of PFOA was degraded, while this was less than 5% for HFPO-DA (Bao et al., 2018). This study shows that oxidation of HFPO-DA is even slower than that of PFOA, which has been shown to be very persistent under environmental conditions.

Under the same conditions, but with 20 mM sulphite instead of persulfate, the reduction of HFPO-
DA and PFOA was tested. In this case no HFPO-DA could be detected anymore at time points later than 2 hours. PFOA was already completely degraded within 2 hours. Similar to the oxidation, the primary degradation due to reduction was faster for PFOA than for HFPO-DA (reaction rates of 0.0410 vs. 0.0338 min\(^{-1}\)). The reaction rate for HFPO-DA was also tested in artificially contaminated river water. The reaction rate was lower compared to that in pure water and decreased to 0.0296 min\(^{-1}\) (Bao et al., 2018). Also for reduction the degradation rate for HFPO-DA is slower than for PFOA. The study is reliable but the relevance for environmental conditions is limited.

3.1.1.3 Phototransformation/photolysis

3.1.1.3.1 Phototransformation in air

The QSAR model AOPWIN v1.92 of the EPISuite tool (US EPA, 2002–2012) predicts degradation rates and half-lives for direct and indirect photolytic degradation in the atmosphere. For the common preset of the model – assuming indirect degradation via OH-radicals, 12 h-day, 1.5e+06 OH radicals per m\(^3\) - the tool predicts a degradation rate constant of 0.52e-12 cm\(^3\)/(molec * s) for HFPO-DA which is equal to an atmospheric half-life of 20.57 days. This estimate is the same as for PFOA and PFHxA. These results can be seen as an estimate only, because perfluorinated substances are not fully within the applicability domain of the EPISuite models.

Some experimental data is available on abiotic degradation in air of the structurally related perfluorinated carboxylic acids. Hurley et al. (2004) studied the kinetics of the reactions of OH radicals with a homologous series of perfluorinated carboxylic acids, F(CF\(_2\))\(_n\)COOH (n = 1, 2, 3, 4), at an air pressure of 700 Torr and a temperature of 296 ± 2 K. For n > 1, the length of the F(CF\(_2\))\(_n\) group had no discernible impact on the reactivity of the molecule. Atmospheric lifetimes of F(CF\(_2\))\(_n\)COOH with respect to reaction with OH radicals are estimated to be approximately 230 days for n = 1 and 130 days for n > 1. Reaction with OH radicals is a minor atmospheric fate of F(CF\(_2\))\(_n\)COOH (Hurley et al., 2004).

From the data available it becomes obvious that the degradation half-life of HFPO-DA in the atmosphere is clearly above the threshold of two days which indicates that the substance has the potential for long range transport. For the assessment of the potential for long range transport the best case half-life of 20.57 days for photolytic degradation in the atmosphere was used (see Section 3.3).

3.1.1.3.2 Phototransformation in water

In the study by Bao et al. (2018) cited above, the degradation of ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate and PFOA was also studied with only ultraviolet light without persulfate or sulfite. For PFOA, degradation after 180 minutes was almost 10%, while less than 5% for HFPO-DA. For HFPO-DA, the degradation under ultraviolet light only was similar to the degradation in the presence of sulfate. It follows that HFPO-DA is less degradable by phototransformation due to ultraviolet light (253.7 nm) than PFOA. The study is reliable but the relevance for environmental conditions is limited.

3.1.1.3.3 Phototransformation in soil

No information available

3.1.1.4 Summary on abiotic degradation

Experimental data for hydrolysis show that ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate is not hydrolysed. In a photoreactor under enhanced ultraviolet light only and oxidative conditions and reductive circumstances, the substance was less degradable than PFOA. QSAR estimates for hydrolysis and phototransformation in air lead to the conclusion that rapid degradation under these conditions is highly unlikely. It follows that 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate is very persistent under environmentally relevant abiotic conditions.
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3.1.2 Biodegradation

3.1.2.1 Biodegradation in water

3.1.2.1.1 Estimated data

The QSAR model BIOWIN v4.10 of the EPISuite tool (US EPA, 2002-2012) includes several QSARs for estimating intrinsic substance properties and environmental fate and behaviour of chemicals, providing degradation timeframes for primary and ultimate degradation of chemicals. BIOWIN also provides an estimate whether a substance fulfils the criteria of being rated as “readily biodegradable”. The outcome of the different BIOWIN QSAR estimates is provided in Table 7.

**Table 7**: Outcome of the different QSAR estimates on biodegradability of HFPO-DA, and PFHxA and PFOA for comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Result (value) HFPO-DA</th>
<th>Result (value) PFHxA</th>
<th>Result (value) PFOA</th>
<th>Conclusions from the estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOWIN 1</td>
<td>-1.2769</td>
<td>-0.5854</td>
<td>-1.0009</td>
<td>Does Not Biodegrade Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOWIN 2</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Does Not Biodegrade Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOWIN 3</td>
<td>1.1634</td>
<td>1.5083</td>
<td>0.8631</td>
<td>Recalcitrant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOWIN 4</td>
<td>2.7383</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>2.4409</td>
<td>Weeks-Months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOWIN 5</td>
<td>0.3069</td>
<td>0.4206</td>
<td>0.3278</td>
<td>Not Readily Degradable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOWIN 6</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>Not Readily Degradable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOWIN 7</td>
<td>-0.2371</td>
<td>-0.3141</td>
<td>-0.9825</td>
<td>Does Not Biodegrade Fast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready biodegradability prediction</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Criteria of BIOWIN predictions are not fulfilled: module BIOWIN 3 should predict &quot;degradation within weeks&quot; or faster and module BIOWIN 5 should result in value ≥ 0.5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combination of these QSARs gives an estimate whether a chemical is potentially persistent in the environment or not. According to REACH guidance document R.11 (ECHA, 2017a), the screening criteria below which persistence for PBT assessment is likely are BIOWIN 2 or BIOWIN 6 scores below 0.5 in combination with a BIOWIN 3 value equal to or below 2.25. The values for HFPO-DA lie well below these screening criteria and thus the QSARs indicate that HFPO-DA is potentially (very) persistent.

For evaluation of the BIOWIN prediction it has to be kept in mind that the outcome for perfluorinated hydrocarbons has to be understood as a vague prediction. This is because the training data set is incompletely implemented for perfluorinated carbon chains. In particular, there is no fragment coefficient for a non-terminal perfluorinated carbon in the BIOWIN models. For example, for HFPO-DA the perfluorinated carbon chain is contributing to the predicted biodegradability score by three fragments of “carbon with 4 single bonds & no hydrogens”, where in addition BIOWIN 1-4 predictions include a specific fragment for a trifluoromethyl group, where the BIOWIN 5 and 6 include fluoride as a fragment, which remarkably has a positive influence on biodegradability in BIOWIN 5 but a (strongly) negative influence on the biodegradability in BIOWIN 6. BIOWIN 7 recognises both additional fragments, but has a coefficient of zero in both cases (i.e. no effect on the prediction of degradability). It should also be noted that in BIOWIN 1-4 the trifluoromethyl fragment is based on only one compound in the training set (3'-Methyl-4'-chloro-2,2,2-trifluorocetphenone, CAS 286017-71-8, which is not a perfluorinated alkyl substance). In the case of BIOWIN 1-2 the amount of trifluoromethyl fragments exceeds the
maximum number of fragments in the training set compounds. Predictions may therefore also be less accurate according to BIOWIN User’s Guide. Based on these observations the BIOWIN models cannot be expected to predict the biodegradability of perfluorinated alkyl carboxylic acids with high reliability. Considering that the perfluorinated carbon chain is expected to be very stable but not properly included in the model, it can be concluded that the persistence of PFASs will be underestimated by the BIOWIN predictions.

Nevertheless, the result of BIOWIN modelling provides sufficient evidence that HFPO-DA will not fulfil the criteria for being rated as “readily biodegradable”, and, considering the above, the screening assessment on persistence of HFPO-DA based on BIOWIN predictions, adds to the weight-of-evidence that HFPO-DA is “potential P or vP” according to ECHA Guidance on PBT/vPvB assessment (ECHA, 2017a).

3.1.2.1.2 Screening tests

The toxicity of H-28397 (88% ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy) propanoate, 13.3% water and an impurity of 3.4 ppm perfluorooctanoic acid) to inocula from municipal sewage sludge was tested separately in a respiratory inhibition test according to OECD TG 209. No toxicity was observed up to the highest tested concentration of 1000 mg/L. The inhibition of respiration ranged from -12.5 to 5.8% for concentrations of H-28397 between 10 and 1000 mg/L, without a dose-response relationship. The toxic reference compound 3,5-dichlorophenol showed an EC50 of approximately 10 mg/L for the inhibition of respiration. The study shows that the test substance is not toxic to microorganisms from activated sludge at the tested concentration range (Vavala and Berti, 2008). A lack of degradation of the test compound can thus not be attributed to toxicity to the bacteria. This is especially relevant because in some of the screening tests described below no toxicity controls were included.

In an OECD 301B study for ready biodegradability 0% mineralisation (CO2 evolution) as well as 0% primary degradation was found after 28 days at a test substance concentration of 112.2-112.7 mg/L of H-28397. The carbon dioxide production in the test vessels and in the abiotic controls with the test substance was less than in the inoculum control blanks without the test substance. The positive control substance sodium benzoate showed 72.8% mineralisation after 28 days, with more than 60% mineralisation within 14 days. The test substance had no inhibitory effect on the degradation of the positive control substance. From these results it is concluded that the substance is not readily biodegradable. The test substance was also analysed by HPLC-MS. It appeared that the recovery of the test substance was higher at the end of the test than at the beginning. Chromatograms showed a single peak. It is concluded in the report that there was no primary degradation either (Vavala and Berti, 2009).

A ready biodegradability study according to the Japanese guideline for biodegradation of chemical substances by microorganisms, which is similar to OECD TG 301C was carried out with FRD-903 (2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy) propanoic acid; 99.6% pure; 0.4% unknown impurities). The test substance concentration was 100 mg/L. Degradation was assessed by the biological oxygen demand (BOD), dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and the analysis of the parent compound by LC-MS/MS. Degradation of the three replicates after 28 days was reported to amount to 3±4%, 1±3% and 1±3%, based on BOD, DOC, and residual test substance respectively. Based on the theoretical oxygen demand, the mineralisation of the reference substance aniline that served as positive control was 72% after 14 days. No toxicity control was included. Only one peak of the test substance FRD-903 was found in the LC-MS/MS chromatograms. It is concluded in the report that the test substance is not readily biodegradable and that it is not structurally transformed under the test conditions (Kawashima, 2009).

An OECD 302C (MITI II) study for inherent biodegradability was performed with FRD-902 (ammonium 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy) propanoate, 86.9% purity). The concentrations of the test substance and the reference substance aniline were 30 mg/L and 100 mg/L, respectively. The sludge content was 100 mg/L (source activated sludge, surface soil and surface water sampled from ten sites from Nanjing city). Mineralisation was followed in time by means of the biological oxygen demand (BOD). Mineralisation calculated as percentage of theoretical oxygen demand was 82.2% after 14 days and 94.2% after 28 days for the reference substance aniline. No toxicity control was included. The triplicate measurements for the test substance FRD-902 all showed <1% mineralisation. Analysis of the test substance by LC-MS/MS
at the end of the 28-d day test period showed 0% degradation in all three replicates. It is concluded in the report that the test substance is not inherently biodegradable under the test conditions (Lili, 2010a).

The same OECD 302C study for inherent biodegradability was conducted with FRD-903 (2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy) propanoic acid, 96% purity). Mineralisation of the reference substance aniline was 74.3% after 14 days and 83.8% after 28 days. Also in this case, no toxicity control was included. The triplicate measurements for the test substance FRD-903 all showed <1% mineralisation. Degradation based on residuals measured by LC-MS/MS amounted to 1±3% in the three replicates. However, this is based on dissipation compared to the abiotic control and is not significant. Thus, no significant degradation compared to the control was observed. It is concluded in the report that the test substance is not inherently degradable (Lili, 2010b).

3.1.2.1.3 Simulation tests (water and sediments)

No data available

3.1.2.2 Biodegradation in soil

No data available

3.1.2.3 Summary and discussion on biodegradation

Based on the lack of any primary degradation in the screening tests available on biodegradation, predictions on biodegradation by BIOWIN, and the very high degree of fluorination it is concluded that the biodegradation of HFPO-DA in the environment is likely to be very slow or negligible.

3.1.3 Field data

HFPO-DA is monitored at locations far away from potential sources including the marine environment (see Section 3.2.5). The travelling distance is large and consequently the time to reach these areas will be very long. This is supporting the assumption that degradation of HFPO-DA under environmental conditions will be very limited.

3.1.4 Summary and discussion of degradation

PFAS compounds are resistant to degradation due to the very stable highly fluorinated alkyl chains. The high persistence is a property that is observed for other perfluorinated substances as well. A number of these structural related substances have already been shown to be very persistent. HFPO-DA is not degradable in screening tests for both abiotic degradation and biodegradation. HFPO-DA is not mineralised in these studies and does not show any primary degradation as well. The lack of biodegradation is also supported by QSAR predictions. Under highly reactive oxidative and reductive conditions, degradation of HFPO-DA occurs, but the degradation rates are lower than for PFOA, which has been shown to be very persistent. High persistency is also supported by monitoring data showing HFPO-DA in detectable concentrations in remote places where there is no indication of a possible direct emission source. Overall, degradation potential of HFPO-DA in all compartments can be concluded to be very low or negligible.

3.2 Environmental distribution

3.2.1 Adsorption/desorption

The value of the logarithm of the organic carbon/water partition coefficient (log $K_{oc}$) for H-28397 has been determined by HPLC according to OECD test guideline 121 (Bloxham, 2008). Seven reference compounds with known log $K_{oc}$ values for soil and sludge were used. Most important details (retention times, log $K_{oc}$ values for the reference compounds) are lacking from the summarising report. The obtained log $K_{oc}$ values were 1.08 for soil and 1.10 for sludge.

The log $K_{oc}$ can also be determined by QSAR programmes from EpiSuite (US EPA, 2002-2012).
With KOCWIN v2.00 the calculated values for HFPO-DA are 2.48 and 1.92 based on molecular connectivity indices and on estimated log $K_{ow}$, respectively. Both methods make use of two correction factors for the carboxylic acid group and for the aliphatic ether group, respectively. Although there are several fluorinated substances in the training data set, there are no poly/perfluorinated compounds like HFPO-DA or PFOA. Thus, there is no correction factor for the group of poly/perfluorinated substances, which means that the estimated log $K_{oc}$ of HFPO-DA is mainly influenced by the carboxylic acid and the ether groups. The estimate based on log $K_{ow}$ does not make a difference in correction factors applied between the acid and the salt, although the input for log $K_{ow}$ is different (see section 1.4). This results in a marked difference between the two: 1.92 for the acid and ~0.18 for the salt, for which there seems a double correction for dissociation, first in the log $K_{ow}$ and then in the fragment for log $K_{oc}$. The MCI method yields the same result in both cases. In both cases the correction for the carboxylic acid group is a generic one that is not dependent on the pKa value. The reliability of these estimates should thus be considered as limited.

Further information is available from the study by Sun et al. (2016), who tested the adsorption of PFASs to powdered activated carbon (PAC) in amber glass bottles. The PAC concentrations used were 30, 60 and 100 mg PAC/L, and these concentrations represent the upper feasible limit used as purification for drinking water preparation. At these PAC doses, around 20%, 30% and 40% of HFPO-DA was removed from the water, respectively. These removal percentages were higher than for perfluorobutanoic acid (PFBA), but lower than for perfluorhexanoic acid (PFHxA) and perfluorobutane sulfonate (PFBS). Percentage removal was higher for the longer chain PFASs, with 90% or more at 100 mg PAC/L for PFHpA, PFOA, PFNA, PFDA, PFHxS and PFOS. This experiment thus confirms the low sorption potential of HFPO-DA.

A test with beds of regenerated subbituminous coal-based granulated activated carbon (GAC) reduced the concentrations of HFPO-DA substantially to 7% after 3500 bed volumes, but after 5000 bed volumes this increased to a value as high as 74%. HFPO-DA was even released from the GAC beds after emission reduction as the effluent concentrations were 28% higher than the influent concentrations. Initial results for anion exchange beds appeared to be more effective but also for this technique the effectiveness decreased with increasing bed volumes passed (Hopkins et al., 2018).

### 3.2.2 Volatilisation

No experimental data are available for Henry’s Law constant. The QSAR program HenryWin v3.20 of EpiSuite (US EPA, 2002-2012) calculates a Henry’s Law constant by the bond method. This value is 20.8 Pa·m$^3$/mol, or 0.00893 unitless (m$^3$/water/m$^3$ air). On the ECHA dissemination website, a Henry’s Law constant has been calculated for the ammonium salt amounting to 4.06·10$^6$ Pa·m$^3$/mol, using the vapour pressure (0.017 Pa at 20 °C) and water solubility (1000 g/L) of the dried substance. It is mentioned that due to the ionic nature of the substance, the vapour pressure will be essentially zero. The presence in air is unlikely.

Considering the low Henry’s law constant and the fact that HFPO-DA is present in the anionic form in the aquatic environment at environmentally relevant conditions, volatilisation from water is expected to be a minor route.

### 3.2.3 Water treatment techniques

A low removal capacity was demonstrated by Sun et al. (2016) by the results of their assessment of the removal of HFPO-DA in the different steps of the drinking water treatment process in a drinking water treatment plant from the Cape Fear River watershed. Water was sampled after each step in the purification process (raw water, ozonation, coagulation/flocculation/sedimentation, settled water ozonation, biological activated carbon (BAC) filtration, and disinfection by medium-pressure UV lamps and free chlorine). No significant removal was observed throughout the whole drinking water treatment process.

In a study by Hopkins et al. (2018) no removal was observed by both conventional surface water treatment processes (coagulation, flocculation, sedimentation, filtration, disinfection with free chlorine) and by several advanced water treatment processes, including raw and settled water ozonation, biofiltration, and disinfection with medium-pressure ultraviolet (UV) lamps. This was determined using of a time series of raw and finished tap water concentrations at a tap water
treatment plant (WTP) located approximately 90 miles downstream of the fluorochemical plant. The hydraulic residence time in the WTP was approximately one day and the finished tap water concentrations matched the raw water concentrations from the previous days.

Similar results on the effect of water treatment techniques are reported by Dutch water producer Oasen after measurements in a WTP with GAC beds, where it is concluded that the removal of the substance using current purification techniques can be regarded as negligible (Roelandse and Timmer, 2017).

High pressure membranes are effective, but this technique is highly energy consuming and poses a problem for the management of the retentate, which has high levels of PFASs and salts (Hopkins et al., 2018). In the public consultation, information was provided on the outcome of a pilot test on the efficiency of GAC beds in the purification of residential wells, which indicated that the substance could be removed. Additional information was also provided by drinking water companies, supporting the above mentioned studies that removal in large-scale facilities was either unsuccessful or only achievable at high costs and led to an additional problem with the generated waste.

### 3.2.4 Distribution modelling

On the ECHA dissemination website it is stated by the registrants that once the substance is emitted to water, it will stay in water. Further, it is mentioned that upon emission to soil the substance will partition to water and that it has a high to very high mobility to groundwater due to its low volatility and low adsorption potential. Upon emission to air, the substance will partition to water and soil due to partitioning and deposition.

This is in line with the physicochemical properties of the substance. Due to the low pKa value, the substance will be primarily in the ionic form in the environment, resulting in the above mentioned low sorption to soil and sediment and low volatilisation to air. Modelling estimates are presented in Section 3.3.

### 3.2.5 Field data

Recently, information coming from monitoring data has started to raise concern with regard to a possible wide spread abundance of HFPO-DA in the environment and in drinking water. These data are summarised below and an overview of monitoring locations with an indication of concentrations detected is provided in the figures in this chapter. It should be emphasized that this may not be a complete overview of data available. Most monitoring data are from peer-reviewed publications, often with emphasis on the methodological development of the analysis of PFASs. Other data originate from laboratories with certified test protocols. The reliability of the data is thus considered high.

**Rhine-Meuse delta**

Since 5 years, information is being generated on the possible presence and distribution of HFPO-DA in the Rhine-Meuse delta. First information stems from 2013. At least in Europe, a combination of river currents and tidal forces and a combination of known and unknown emission sources may be responsible for the overall abundance profile.

In August 2013, water samples were taken in the Rhine-Meuse delta (Heydebreck et al., 2015, Heydebreck, 2017). About 45 km downstream (distances obtained from maps of waterways, Rijkswaterstaat (2013)) of a fluorochemical production plant near Dordrecht (NL), a HFPO-DA concentration of 91.4 ng/L was found in the river het Scheur near Rozenburg (NL). At the same time, no HFPO-DA was detected (above the method detection limit (<0.14 ng/L)) in the river de Oude Maas, which is about 10 km downstream of the fluorochemical plant. One tentative explanation for the different concentrations observed in het Scheur and de Oude Maas may be that de Oude Maas is a different confluence than het Scheur. This possible explanation is supported by further data showing that also in the river het Hollands Diep near Willemstad, which is about 15 km further downstream of de Oude Maas no HFPO-DA was detected. In Germany, in the river Rhine at Leverkusen, a concentration of HFPO-DA of 108 ng/L was found. At the other sampling stations, HFPO-DA was not detected (<0.14 ng/L) except for a low concentration of 0.75 ng/L at the sampling site Tolkamer (NL) in the river Rhine.
In a follow up study in September 2015, HFPO-DA was sampled in large transects of the river Rhine up to the Dutch-German border. The average concentration of HFPO-DA sampled in this study was 0.03±0.01 ng/L (Heydebreck, 2017). These data seem to suggest that diffuse sources of HFPO-DA are present upstream of the fluorochemical production plant at Dordrecht, and this was concluded by the authors as most likely explanation of the observed abundance profile. In the vicinity of Leverkusen where a concentration of 108 ng/L was found in 2013, effluents of three sewage treatment plants of the chemical park were sampled as well to investigate whether this chemical park could be the source of the earlier detected peak in HFPO-DA concentration. HFPO-DA was not detected in these samples (Method Detection Limit was 0.002 ng/L), indicating that at this time no HFPO-DA was emitted from the chemical park.

In October 2016, samples were taken both upstream and downstream of the fluorochemical production plant in the Netherlands (Gebbink et al. 2017). Concentrations varying from 108 to 812 ng/L were found at sites downstream of the production plant near Dordrecht. These sites were, in order of increasing concentrations, the rivers de Noord at Papendrecht, Beneden Merwede at Papendrecht, de Noord at Alblasserdam, de Oude Maas at Dordrecht, de Nieuwe Maas at Ridderkerk, de Lek at Kinderdijk (respectively about 4, 2, 8, 4, 20, 15 and <1 km, downstream of the production plant). Concentrations of 48 to 58 ng/L were found at the rivers Breede diep near Hoek van Holland, het Scheur at Vlaardingen, and de Nieuwe Waterweg at Maassluis (55, 40, and 45 km downstream respectively). The concentration of 58 ng/L found in the river de Nieuwe Waterweg at Maassluis is comparable to the concentration of 91.4 ng/L that was found by Heydebreck in 2013 in het Scheur near Rozenburg. Interestingly, these two locations are positioned at almost opposite sides of the same waterway. Lower concentrations were found by Gebbink et al. (2017) in the south branch of the system of waterways, with concentrations varying from 1.7 to 14 ng/L in the rivers de Dordtsche Kil at Dordrecht, de Oude Maas at Zwi jndrecht and de Oude Maas at Hoog vliet (10, 10, and 30 km downstream respectively). The concentration of 6.3 ng/L in de Oude Maas detected by Gebbink et al. (2017) in 2016 is higher than what had been detected earlier by Heydebreck in 2013, who did not detect HFPO-DA at almost the same sampling site (<0.14 ng/L). Of the sites upstream of the fluorochemical production plant, only at the sampling site Beneden Merwede at Sliedrecht, which is about 1 km upstream of the plant, a concentration of 22 ng/L was found. This observation may possibly be explained by the tidal influence in this area that may cause HFPO-DA to be found upstream of the fluorochemical plant. A similar explanation may hold for the location Kinderdijk, which is also slightly upstream of a confluence and where HFPO-DA was detected in a concentration of 433 ng/L. Concentrations in four other locations further upstream of the waterway system of the river Rhine, were below the method limit of quantification (<0.2 ng/).

Pan et al. (2018) monitored 20 locations along a trajectory from the river Mainz at Offenbach (DE) along the river Rhine to the river Nederrijn at Wijk bij Duurstede (NL) and the River Waal at Zaltbommel (NL) in December 2016. HFPO-DA was detected in all samples (method detection limit 0.38 ng/L) and concentrations ranged from 0.59 to 1.98 ng/L, with rather constant concentration of 0.8 to 1.0 ng/L upstream up to Duisburg (DE). The overall average and median concentrations were 0.99 and 0.90 ng/L, respectively.

In other samples from the Netherlands in 2017 (Versteegh and De Voogt, 2017), concentrations of 5.2, 12 and 16 ng/L were found in the river de Lek at Bergambacht, which is about 15 km upstream of Kinderdijk. Also here, tidal influences cannot be excluded to explain these concentrations. At Kinderdijk a concentration of 126 ng/L was found, while at Papendrecht and Ridderkerk concentrations of 60 and 90 ng/L were found, respectively. At concentrations more upstream in the river Rhine and tributaries (Lobith, Bimmen, Nieuwegein and Andijk) concentrations of HFPO-DA were 1 ng/L or less. Part of these concentrations are however higher than the concentrations found in the German part of the river Rhine in 2015. In the samples from the river Meuse and tributaries reported by Versteegh and De Voogt (2017), HFPO-DA was also detected in samples upstream of the city’s Hertogenbosch. Concentrations of HFPO-DA detected there were 1 ng/L or less. However, a small tributary appeared to contain concentrations of 42 and 47 ng/L. These concentrations point at a local source of HFPO-DA present there that is different from the fluorochemical production plant. Concentrations west of this point in the Meuse and some other (small) waterways varied from 4.3 to 47 ng/L.

In the same region, in smaller water bodies around the city of Helmond, HFPO-DA was detected in concentrations ranging from <20 to 6500 ng/L. Concentrations in Helmond could be attributed
to a local source, a company that operated as a subcontractor for the production plant in Dordrecht. The highest concentration was found in a local pond around 500 m from this facility (Van Bentum et al., 2018). Earlier measurements at the same locations resulted in HFPO-DA concentrations of 65 to 7500 ng/L (Aa en Maas, 2018 7). At the location with the highest concentration, a local pond, also a concentration of 15000 ng/L was measured in the same period (NVWA, 2018).

Concentrations in the Rhine-Meuse delta are shown in Figure 6. It should be noted that the samples from the upstream area of the river Rhine from September/October 2015 (Heydebreck et al., 2015, Heydebreck, 2017) are remarkably lower than the concentrations of the samples from the same area in December 2016 (Pan et al., 2018). The average concentration in 2015 was 0.03 ng/L, while this was 0.99 ng/L in 2016. Also in the upstream part of the River Meuse, concentrations were in the order of 0.5-0.8 ng/L (Versteegh and De Voogt, 2017), which is comparable to the upstream concentrations in the River Rhine at the end of 2016.

![Figure 6: Concentrations in of HFPO-DA in surface waters in the Rhine-Meuse delta. Only data for which coordinates are available are included.](image)

**Other European rivers**

In August 2013, three water samples were taken in the Ems delta in Germany (Heydebreck et al., 2015, Heydebreck, 2017). A concentration of 1.80 ng/L was measured in one sampling location in the Ems estuary at Wybelsum. This sampling is in the estuary and has an influence from the North Sea. In the river Ems at Gandersum and Leer concentrations were below the method detection limit (<0.14 ng/L). HFPO-DA was not detected (method detection limit 0.13 ng/L) in three samples from the river Weser (DE) between Sandstedt and Bremerhaven in March 2014 (Heydebreck et al., 2015, Heydebreck, 2017). To assess the sources of HFPO-DA in the North Sea sampling was conducted in the Elbe (DE) in March 2014. Between Hamburg-Altona and Bütteler

---

Hafen HFPO-DA was not detected (method detection limit 0.13 ng/L). From Dresden to Brunsbüttel, 22 samples were taken from the river Elbe in September 2014, in which HFPO-DA was not detected (method detection limit not reported) (Heydebreck et al., 2015, Heydebreck, 2017).

In October 2016 HFPO-DA was also found in six locations in the river Thames (UK) from Oxford to Canary Wharf in London (Pan et al., 2018). All concentrations were above the method detection limit (0.38 ng/L) and ranged from 0.70 to 1.58 ng/L. The lowest concentration was observed in Oxford, the highest at Canary Wharf. The average and median concentrations were 1.12 and 1.10 ng/L, respectively.

Also in Sweden HFPO-DA was observed in the river Svartån and lake Hjälmar near Örebro, Riddarfjärden, Beckholmsundet and near Stockholm in Lake Mälaren and between Lake Mälaren and the Baltic Sea in September 2016 (Pan et al., 2018). Concentrations were above the method detection limit (0.38 ng/L) and ranged between 0.88 and 2.68 ng/L, both concentrations found in the same trench near Stockholm. The average concentration of all 10 samples was 1.47 ng/L, the median concentration was 1.38 ng/L. 

More inland, HFPO-DA was not detected in the Swedish lakes Vättern and Vänern (<0.02 ng/L) sampled in May 2017. Also in several other freshwater bodies in Greenland, Iceland, the Faroe Islands, Norway and Finland HFPO-DA was not detected. These data include two lakes in Greenland near Isortoq and near the Kobbefjord near Nuuk sampled in September 2017, Lake Eliðavatn in Iceland sampled in September 2017, Lake Leitisvatn near Sørvágsvatn and Lake Myrene near Vestmanna on the Faroe Islands sampled in September 2017, two locations in Lake Mjøsa in Norway sampled in August 2017 and March 2018, lake Ørn and lake Silkeborg near Silkeborg in Denmark sampled in August and September 2017, and the Helsinki archipelago near the mouth of the river Vantaa and Lake Pirkkalan Pyhääjärvi near Tampere, both in Finland sampled in August 2017 (Kärrman et al., 2019). Some of these lakes are in very remote areas. This is especially the case for the lakes in Greenland, Iceland and the Faroe Islands.

**Marine environment**

In March and August 2014, two sampling campaigns were conducted in the North Sea and the Wadden Sea along the Dutch coast and further up to the German Bight. Further, samples were taken from the estuaries of the Ems, Weser and Elbe (Heydebreck et al., 2015, Heydebreck, 2017). HFPO-DA was detected in all samples along the coastline with an average concentration of 2.3 ± 0.9 ng/L in March and 1.5 ± 0.3 ng/L in August. In two samples from the Elbe estuary from March HFPO-DA was also detected in concentrations of 0.61 and 1.46 ng/L, but was HFPO-DA was not detected in 7 samples more upstream (method detection limit 0.13 ng/L). The sites where HFPO-DA was detected were concluded to be influenced by sea water based on the salinity of the samples. HFPO-DA was also detected in August at two sites from the Ems estuary and at the mouth of the river Ems into the estuary in concentrations of 0.62 to 1.32 ng/L, but not detected in two samples more upstream. Based on the salinity of the samples taken, it was concluded that these sites where HFPO-DA was found are influenced by seawater as well. These data show that in both the Elbe and the Ems estuary concentrations of HFPO-DA are higher in water with higher salinity. This confirms that the river water is not the source of HFPO-DA for these two rivers. Instead, the authors hypothesise that HFPO-DA is transported from the Rhine-Meuse delta along the coastline of the North Sea to the German Bight.

In March 2016, samples were taken from piers on the coast of the German Baltic Sea (Heydebreck, 2017). HFPO-DA was found at all 16 sampling sites (method detection limit 0.012 ng/L) with an average concentration of 0.14 ng/L. Similar to the observations from the Ems and Elbe, a positive correlation is observed between the concentration of HFPO-DA and the salinity of the samples. Also here, the author suggests that this indicates that HFPO-DA is not originating from direct riverine input into the Baltic Sea, but from indirect input via the North Sea, which has a higher salinity than the Baltic Sea, and for which the source may likely be the Rhine-Meuse delta.

Concentrations in the Wadden Sea, the German Bight and the German Baltic Sea, and the Weser, the Ems and the Elbe are shown in Figure 7. It should be noted that in these samples from 2014 and 2016 the concentrations in these northern German rivers are lower than in the Wadden Sea and German Bight, indicating that these are not the source of HFPO-DA.
Figure 7: Concentrations of HFPO-DA in surface waters in the Baltic Sea, the Wadden Sea and the rivers Ems, Weser, and Elbe.

Although concentrations in the marine environment are low compared to concentrations of HFPO-DA detected near known point sources, monitoring data suggest that the substance is transported in water over very long distances. In June 2014, PFASs were sampled in the Norwegian Sea from a ship 11 m below the surface (Heydebreck, 2017). HFPO-DA could be measured in three sampling points in the Norwegian Sea in concentrations with an average concentration of 0.349 ng/L, ranging from 0.178 to 0.500 ng/L. Considering only negligible input from Norway and the UK, it was concluded by the author that these HFPO-DA concentrations could be explained by HFPO-DA transported over a distance of at least 1700 km after its emission from the Rhine Meuse delta into the North Sea. The substance was not detected in two samples further northwest of the three samples mentioned above (method detection limit 0.023 ng/L). This observation was explained by the authors from the fact that the first three samples are taken from water in the Norwegian Coastal Current and the latter two samples are taken from water in the East Iceland Current, which is not fed by water from the Rhine Meuse delta.

In Figure 8 the concentrations of HFPO-DA in Europe, including these marine samples, are presented.
Figure 8: Concentrations of HFPO-DA in surface waters in Europe, including the marine environment.

Other continents

HFPO-DA has been measured in river water in Asia and North America. In China, HFPO-DA was monitored in samples from April 2014 in the Xiaoqing River and some tributaries as well as in Laizhou Bay. In the upper part of the Xiaoqing River HFPO-DA was not detected but downstream concentrations of more than 100 ng/L were measured with peak concentrations of 2125 to 3825 ng/L at two sites in the Xiaoqing River and one in its tributary Dongzhulong River. These concentrations are attributed by the author to the fluoropolymer industry located in the north of Zibo. In Laizhou Bay concentrations were observed in the order of 6 to 55 ng/L. HFPO-DA could be detected at sites up to more than 30 km away from the mouth of the river. At the sites with the highest HFPO-DA concentrations, other PFAS were detected at higher concentrations (Heydebreck, 2015, 2017).

In the same area and partly the same sampling locations a second monitoring study was performed in November/December 2015 (Pan et al. 2017). The same pattern was observed with concentrations of HFPO-DA in the tributary Dongzhulong River, varying from 1750 to 2060 ng/L downstream of the fluorochemical production plant. After the inflow of the Dongzhulong River in the Xiaoqing River, HFPO-DA gradually decreased from 960 ng/L to 118 ng/L, most likely due to inflow of other tributaries. Upstream of the fluorochemical production plant in the Xiaoqing River and its tributary Dongzhulong River concentrations varied between 1.61 and 3.64 ng/L. In this study, HFPO-DA appeared to be present in relatively small concentrations compared to hexafluoropropylene oxide trimer acid (HFPO-TA) and PFOA, which together were observed to contribute to more than 90% to the total concentration of PFASs in those samples.

Several Chinese rivers and lakes were monitored in the period October to December 2016 (Pan et al., 2018). These rivers included the Liao River (6 locations), the Huai River (9 locations), the
Yellow River (15 locations), the Yangtze River (35 locations), Chao Lake and surrounding rivers (13 locations), Tai Lake (15 locations) and the Pearl River (13 locations). The samples in the Yangtze River ranged in HFPO-DA concentrations from <0.18 to 1.54 ng/L with an average concentration of 0.73 ng/L and a median of 0.67 ng/L. In Chao Lake and surrounding rivers that finally end up in the Yangtze River, HFPO-DA concentrations ranged from 0.93 to 3.32 ng/L with an average concentration of 1.92 ng/L and a median of 1.81 ng/L. In a large part of Tai Lake (Lake Taihu) similar concentrations were found with a minimum of 0.38 ng/L and a median value for the whole lake of 0.77 ng/L. However, in the north-eastern part of the lake HFPO-DA concentration were elevated with a maximum concentration of 143.7 ng/L and an average value for the whole lake of 14.0 ng/L. HFPO-DA concentrations in the Yellow River ranged from <0.18 to 1.74 ng/L with an average concentration of 1.01 ng/L and a median of 1.30 ng/L. The concentrations in the upstream western part of the Yellow River were all below the detection limit of 0.18 ng/L, while the concentrations in the downstream eastern part separated by around 600 km distance varied from 1.00 to 1.74 ng/L. Concentrations in the Pearl River, the Liao River and the Huai River were rather similar. HFPO-DA concentrations in the Pearl River ranged from 0.21 to 10.3 ng/L with an average concentration of 1.51 ng/L and a median of 0.70 ng/L. HFPO-DA concentrations in the Liao River ranged from 0.62 to 4.51 ng/L with an average concentration of 1.44 ng/L and a median of 0.88 ng/L. HFPO-DA concentrations in the Pearl River ranged from 0.83 to 3.62 ng/L with an average concentration of 1.66 ng/L and a median of 1.40 ng/L.

Water of rice paddy fields near four cities was monitored for PFASs (Cui et al., 2018). Two of the cities (Changshu and Huantai) have a large-scale fluorochemical industry, while the other two cities (Quzhou and Zhoushan) do not have such industries. The HFPO-DA concentration in Huantai (North of Zibo) was 410 ng/L, in Changsu 47.8 ng/L, in Zhoushan 2.96 ng/L and in Quzhou 1.91 ng/L. Indeed, there is a strong influence of the nearby industries.

In November 2016, 6 locations in the Han River near Seoul (South Korea) were sampled (Pan et al., 2018). HFPO-DA concentrations ranged from 0.78 to 2.49 ng/L with an average concentration of 1.38 ng/L and a median of 1.16 ng/L. A summary of the monitoring data in the eastern part of China and South Korea is given in Figure 9.
In the USA, HFPO-DA was monitored in the Cape Fear river (North Carolina) in summer 2012. HFPO-DA was detected in samples downstream of a fluorochemical plant (Strynar et al., 2015). In a follow-up study, the Cape Fear river was monitored at three points that are used for the abstraction of drinking water in the period June to December 2013. HFPO-DA was detected in the most downstream sampling point in concentrations varying from 55 to 4560 ng/L over the sampling period. The average concentration of HFPO-DA at this sampling point was 631 ng/L. The concentration varied with the water flux. The estimated mass flux of HFPO-DA was on average 5.9 kg/d, varying from 0.6 to 24 kg/d (Sun et al., 2016).

Further monitoring data from the Cape Fear River, mostly from June and July 2017, were retrieved from the North Carolina Environmental Quality website on GenX providing sampling data on HFPO-DA (https://deq.nc.gov/news/hot-topics/genx-investigation/genx-sampling-sites). For raw river water at the Hoffer water treatment plant, which is upstream of the fluorochemical plant, the concentrations varied between 4 and 13 ng/L. Surface waters for three downstream intake points along the river varied between 30.4 and 830 ng/L, with the highest concentrations found in the beginning of the sampling period, mid-June 2017.

Additional monitoring data were retrieved from a report on the chemical and spatial distribution of PFAS in the Cape Fear River (Geosyntec Consultants, 2018). In September 2017, concentrations nearby the factory ranged from <10 ng/L in the samples upstream of the plant to 24 to 52 ng/L in the two most downstream locations (about 3.5 and 7 km downstream). In May 2018, these concentrations ranged from <4 ng/L in the samples upstream of the plant to 16 to 26 ng/L in the two most downstream locations. Measurements along the river over 132 miles in June 2018 show concentrations that are <10 ng/L upstream of the fluorochemical plant and ranging from <10 to 17 ng/L (median value of 11 ng/L) downstream of the plant.
In June 2017, the concentrations in Georgia Branch Creek and Willis Creek were 540-690 and 230-450 ng/L, respectively. In May 2018, these concentrations were still 520 and 560-590 ng/L, respectively (Geosyntec Consultants, 2018). Concentrations of HFPO-DA were also determined in lakes nearby the fluorochemical plant (NCDEQ, 2018c, NCDEQ, 2017, NCDEQ and NCDHHS Science Advisory Board, 2018). The concentrations in Marsh Wood Lake in Cumberland County (NC) were determined twice in October 2017 and March 2018, and amount to 915 and 968 ng/L, respectively. The concentration in Pages Lake near Camp Dixie in Bladen County (NC) was determined in October 2017 and was 620 ng/L. These lakes are approximately 1.5 km north and 3 km south of the fluorochemical plant in North Carolina.

The combined monitoring data show a decrease in the Cape Fear River from June 2017 to June 2018. This decrease in concentrations follows a reduction in emission sources to the Cape Fear River in 2017 (Geosyntec Consultants, 2018, Hopkins et al., 2018). However, local creeks and lakes do not show such a rapid reduction in concentrations.

Along the Delaware River and its tributary Schuykill River, HFPO-DA was measured at twelve locations in September and December 2016 (Pan et al., 2018). Concentrations ranged from 0.78 to 8.75 ng/L with an average concentration of 3.32 ng/L and a median concentration of 2.02 ng/L. The 4 locations monitored in September 2016 had all concentrations below 1 ng/L. The 8 locations monitored in December 2016 varied from 1.45 to 8.75 ng/L.

A summary of the surface water concentrations in the eastern part of the USA is presented in Figure 10.

![Figure 10: Monitoring data of HFPO-DA in surface waters in the eastern part of the USA.](image-url)
Air and rain water

Besides data on the presence of HFPO-DA in surface water, there is also information available on the presence of HFPO-DA in rain water and smaller water bodies used as irrigation water for vegetable gardens. Results of the measurements of soil and vegetables are reported in Section 3.5. In the vicinity of the fluorochemical plant near Dordrecht (NL) rain water that was used to irrigate vegetables, was sampled in September 2017 from rain barrels and other vessels that were connected to roofs of synthetic material. The concentrations of HFPO-DA in these water samples ranged from 11.5 to 3078 ng/L, with a geometric mean value of 102 ng/L. Because samples were not directly collected, but collected from rain barrels concentrations could be influenced by other sources e.g. from the synthetic materials. Ditches adjacent to vegetable gardens that are further disconnected from the river, had concentrations varying from 9.7 to 956.5 ng/L, with a geometric mean value 78 ng/L. Also in rain water collected in Bilthoven (NL), which is more than 50 km from the fluorochemical plant, a concentration of 12 ng/L was found for HFPO-DA. Also PFOA was detected above the LOQ in all water samples (2.3 – 4670 ng/L), with 8.4 ng/L at the reference site (Van Poll, 2018).

Also the North Carolina Division of Air Quality has sampled rain water during rain events on 28-29 January and 4-5 February 2018 at 10 sites within 3 miles around the fluorochemical plant. Concentrations varied from none detected to 630 ng/L with a median value 34 ng/L (NCDEQ, 2018b). Further information from 28 February 2018 to 2 March 2018 shows concentrations at 12 locations within 7 miles of the fluorochemical plant varying from 45.3 to 810 ng/L with a geometric mean value of 159 ng/L. The concentrations in rain water matched the concentrations found in private wells rather well (NCDEQ, 2018a). No further information is available on these measurements.

HFPO-DA was found in concentrations up to 4000 ng/L in private wells close to the fluorochemical plant in North Carolina with no direct emission of the substance and also in disconnected water bodies within 20 miles of a fluorochemical plant near Parkersburg, West Virginia (Hopkins et al., 2018). It is suggested by the authors that this is caused by air emissions of HFPO-DA and or its precursors with subsequent wet and/or dry deposition and percolation into the surficial aquifer. 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(1,1,2,2,3,3,3-heptafluoropropoxy)propanoyl fluoride (C3 dimer acid fluoride) is mentioned specifically as precursor. It is estimated that the fluorochemical plant in North Carolina emitted 230 to 300 kg to the air on a yearly basis between 2012 and 2016.

Drinking water

HFPO-DA was found in drinking water from the cities of Zwijndrecht, Dordrecht and Papendrecht in concentrations of 0.25, 0.48 and 11 ng/L, sampled in October 2016. At the same time, concentrations of HFPO-DA in drinking water of the cities of Sliedrecht, Utrecht and Wageningen (all upstream of the fluorochemical production plant) were below the method quantification limit (<0.2 ng/L) (Gebbink et al., 2017). Also in other cities in the western part of the Netherlands detectable concentrations in drinking water were reported (unpublished). In a follow up research conducted by drinking water companies, a highest concentration of 30 ng/L was found in drinking water prepared from a river bank filtrate from the river Beneden Merwede in July 2016. In drinking water prepared from water from the river Meuse in the period summer 2016 – summer 2017, HFPO-DA was found in concentrations up to 11 ng/L (Versteegh & de Voogd, 2017).

HFPO-DA was also detected in six tap water samples from six different places in the Netherlands (Brandsma et al., 2019). The tap water was collected in June 2017. The concentrations in finished drinking water ranged from 1.4 to 8.0 ng/L. The highest concentration of 8.0 ng/L was found in drinking water from the city of Alblasserdam abstracted from the river Lek at Nieuw Lekkerland, which is close the fluorochemical plant. Drinking water from the cities of Rotterdam and Spijkenisse contained 5.9 ng/L, and from the city of Dordrecht 3.1 ng/L. The drinking water from these cities is prepared from water abstracted from the river Meuse, which confirms the presence of HFPO-DA in this river. The drinking water of the town of Goedereede, which is abstracted from both Haringvliet and the river Meuse contained 1.8 ng/L. The lowest concentration of 1.4 ng/L was found in the drinking water of the city of Gouda, which is abstracted from the river Lek at Bergambacht, which is around 10 km upstream of the location at Nieuw Lekkerland.
In the Cape Fear River area (NC, USA), concentrations of 400 to 500 ng/L were observed in drinking water in August 2013 abstracted from the river 90 miles downstream of the fluorochemical plant (Sun et al., 2016). A month after an emission reduction of HFPO-DA in June 2017, concentrations in drinking water of the water treatment plant 90 miles downstream of the fluorochemical plant dropped from over 700 ng/L to 40-50 ng/L (Hopkins et al., 2018). Data obtained from the North Carolina Environmental Quality website on GenX providing sampling data on HFPO-DA (https://deq.nc.gov/news/hot-topics/genx-investigation/genx-sampling-sites) show that all water treatment plants downstream of the fluorochemical plant have similar concentrations and trends, with drinking water concentrations around 40 ng/L by November 2018.

**Biota**

In a few monitoring programmes from the northern European countries, biota samples were analysed for HFPO-DA as well. These samples originate from mostly remote areas. In none of the samples a nearby source of HFPO-DA was known.

HFPO-DA was not detected in eggs of seabirds from small islands before the coasts of Greenland, Island, Faroe Islands or Sweden. These eggs were of black guillemot from Scoresbysund (Greenland) and Koltur (Faroe Islands), common guillemot from Grimsey and Bjarnarey (Iceland) and Stora Karlsö (Sweden), and northern fulmar from Skuvoy (Faroe Islands). The detection limit was 0.4 ng/g wwt, except for the sample of black guillemot eggs from Scoresbysund, which had a detection limit of 0.05 ng/g wwt. The eggs originate from the period June 2016 to September 2017 (Kärrman et al., 2019).

HFPO-DA was not detected in marine fish samples near Greenland, Norway, Denmark and Sweden. The fish were Greenland cod from the Kobbefjord in Greenland, Atlantic Pollock from the Oslofjord in Norway, Atlantic cod and European flounder from the Agersø Sund in Denmark and Arctic herring from the Bothnian Sea in Sweden. The detection limit was 0.4 ng/g wwt, except for the sample of Greenland cod from the Kobbefjord, which had a detection limit of 0.2 ng/g wwt. The fish were sampled in the period September 2016 to September 2017 (Kärrman et al., 2019).

HFPO-DA was not detected in freshwater fish from Greenland, Iceland, Faroe Islands, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland. The fish were European perch from lake Mjøsa in Norway, lake Övre Skärsjön in Sweden, lakes Ørn and Silkeborg in Denmark and lake Lohjanjärvi, Pirkkalan Pyhäjärvi downstream of Tampere and Pihlajasaaari in the Helsinki archipelago in Finland, brown trout from lake Leitisvatn on the Faroe Islands and lakes Elliðavatn and Stóra Fossvatn in Iceland, and Arctic char from lake Myrarnar on the Faroe Islands and from Isortoq in Greenland. The detection limit was 0.4 ng/g wwt, except for the sample of Arctic char from Greenland, which had a detection limit of 0.02 ng/g wwt. The fish originate from the period September 2016 to September 2017 (Kärrman et al., 2019).

In the Netherlands, China and the USA, HFPO-DA has been detected in a few freshwater fish (see also Section 3.4.1). The concentrations were 4.7 ng/g wwt in an individual common carp from the Netherlands, 1.53 ng/g wwt in common carp (n=15) from China and 0.27 in individual reear sunfish from the USA, but HFPO-DA was not detected in blue catfish and largemouth bass from the same location. These fish all originated from areas with highly elevated concentrations of HFPO-DA. The concentrations are only a factor of 12 or less higher than the limit of detection for most of the samples from the study by Kärrman et al. (2019).

HFPO-DA was not detected in marine mammals from Greenland, Faroe Islands and Denmark. The mammals were harbor porpoise from the Flensbjerg fjord in Denmark and grey seal from the Åbenrå fjord in Denmark, pilot whales from Torshavn, Hvalvik and Tjornuvik on the Faroe Islands, humpback whale from West Greenland, ringed seal from the Ilulissat Ice fjord in Greenland, and white beaked dolphin and polar bears from Tassilaq in Greenland. The detection limit was 0.2 ng/g wwt, for the samples from Greenland and 0.05 ng/g wwt for the samples from the Faroe Islands and Denmark. The mammals originate from the period 2015-2017 (Kärrman et al., 2019, Heimstad et al., 2018).

HFPO-DA was not detected in terrestrial mammals from Greenland, Iceland, Sweden and Finland.
The mammals were brown bear from Kuusamo in Finland and reindeer from Isortoq and Nuuk area in Greenland, the eastern region of Iceland, Norrbotten in Sweden and Ylitornio in Finland. The detection limit was 0.4 ng/gwet, except for the sample of reindeer from Greenland and the brown bear, which had a detection limit of 0.2 ng/gwet. The reindeer originate from the period August 2017 to October 2017 (Kärrman et al., 2019).

Air, soil and biota samples were collected in 2017 in the area near Oslo, Norway. Air, soil and earthworms were collected at five locations, eggs of fieldfare at ten locations, brown rats (liver) at four locations, red fox (liver) at six locations, eggs of sparrowhawks at ten locations, eggs of tawny owls at seven locations and three badgers (liver). HFPO-DA was not found in any of the samples (Heimstad et al., 2018). The limit of detection for HFPO-DA was on average 0.5 ng/g (according to author, LOD not published in report). In a Norwegian study from 2016, HFPO-DA was not detected in waste water, liver from rats from Oslo and from a landfill, sediment, liver of cod, common shore crab and winkle from the Oslofjord and sediment, liver of large perch, filet of small perch, roach, bream, grayling and whitefish and whole body homogenate of small fish from lake Mjøsa, and in house dust and indoor air from Oslo. Limit of detection and limits of quantification were not reported (Konieczny et al., 2017).

Some data are available for freshwater fish from regions with elevated HFPO-DA concentrations. These are mentioned in section 3.4.1 concerning bioaccumulation aquatic organisms.

### 3.2.6 Summary and discussion of environmental distribution

HFPO-DA is very persistent, has a very low adsorption to organic carbon and other solids and has a low volatility. This combination of properties makes the substance very mobile in the aquatic environment, reaching areas far away from direct emissions. Monitoring data confirm this behaviour and show that HFPO-DA can be widely distributed via waterways far from the point of emission, including the marine environment. This observation is supported by monitoring data from the Netherlands, China and the USA where concentrations in surface water were studied in relation to known industrial emission sources.

However, HFPO-DA is also detected in surface water at locations that could not be explained by any known, local emission source. This finding is also observed by Pan et al. (2018), who state that these novel PFASs, especially HFPO-DA, HFPO-TA, and 6:2 H-PFESA, show ubiquitous occurrence across the global environment. Concentrations upstream of rivers along which no known fluorochemical production facility is located suggest the presence of diffuse emission sources.

Also emission to air and transport via air (potentially over long distances) is mentioned to play a role in the widespread distribution of HFPO-DA. In this process, emissions to air of C3 dimer acid fluoride is mentioned as a possible airborne precursor of HFPO-DA. C3 dimer acid fluoride hydrolyses quickly to form HFPO-DA (Hopkins et al., 2018). HFPO-DA is measured in rain water. The observed concentrations in disconnected water bodies, soil and ground water might thus be linked to subsequent wet and dry deposition of HFPO-DA after emission to air of HFPO-DA and/or its precursors.

Monitoring data indicate that HFPO-DA is transported by sea currents over very long distances reaching the North Sea, the Wadden Sea and the German Bight. The available information demonstrates that HFPO-DA is even further transported over the North Sea to the Norwegian Sea and along the coast of Denmark to enter the Baltic Sea.

Although the interpretation of monitoring data is generally complicated and the presence of a particular substance in the environment is not necessarily associated with persistence, the observations described above for HFPO-DA in fresh water and marine water show that HFPO-DA is very mobile and very persistent, and is subject to long range transport over vast distances by water. This conclusion is especially deduced from the presence of HFPO-DA in huge water bodies (strong dilution) in combination with a very long hydraulic travelling time, i.e. in the Norwegian Sea and the Baltic Sea. HFPO-DA is also detected in drinking water at locations downstream of fluorochemical production plants.
### 3.3 Data indicating potential for long-range transport

Section 3.2.5 gives an extensive outline of monitoring data for HFPO-DA showing that this substance is widespread over Europe, the US and China. Except from elevated concentrations near point sources, HFPO-DA is also found at locations without evident emissions (e.g. U.K., Sweden, upstream the river Rhine). The monitoring data for fresh water and for marine water provide a clear indication that HFPO-DA is subject to long range transport over vast distances by water (Heydebreck, 2017). Monitoring data suggest that travelling distances from known emission sources to sites of detection can be as large as 1700 km, e.g. from the Dutch river delta all the way up to the Norwegian sea. Furthermore, HFPO-DA is detected in ground water and in drinking water (after drinking water treatments) at locations downstream of fluorochemical production plants. Consequently, the monitoring data as presented in Section 3.2.5 clearly indicate the potential for long range transport of HFPO-DA.

Also, HFPO-DA's physical-chemical properties (Section 1.4), very high persistency (Section 3.1) and its estimated atmospheric half-life indicate that the substance is capable to be transported to remote areas. Annex D, Section 1 (d) of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) states the criterion for atmospheric half-life >2 days (48 hours), which is by far exceeded for HFPO-DA with an estimated atmospheric half-life of 20.57 days by AOPWin v1.93 of EpiSuite (see Section 3.1.1.3.1)\(^8\). This very long half-life is explained by the perfluorinated carbon backbone and the ether bond of HFPO-DA, which do not offer any suitable atomic site where the OH-radical, or ozone, could start oxidation/degradation. The only perceived site of oxidation is the carboxylic acid group which might be slightly vulnerable to oxidation by OH-radicals. The half-life estimate for HFPO-DA in the atmosphere is therefore identical to the estimates by AOPWin for all perfluorinated carboxylic acids like PFOA and PFHxA. For PFCAs the long atmospheric half-life has been experimentally confirmed (Section 3.1.1.3.1).

To substantiate the assumed Long Range Transport, the transport potential was modelled using the OECD tool for estimation of the Long Range Transport Potential [LRTP Tool; OECD, 2009; Wegmann et al. (2009)]\(^9\) and is evaluated against the screening criteria as they are included for the potential for long-range environmental transport in Annex D, Section 1 (d) of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). The LRTP Tool is a spreadsheet form based on multimedia fate models. The model requires molecular mass, air-water (\(K_{aw}\)) and octanol-water (\(K_{ow}\)) partition coefficients and (estimated) half-lives in air, water and soil as input parameters for the modeling. The tool then estimates a characteristic travel distance (CTD), indicating the distance from a point source at which the chemical's concentration has dropped to 38% of its initial concentration) and an estimated overall environmental persistence (\(P_{ov}\)) in the environment (an overall half-life taking into account the estimated volumes of the emission in the different environmental compartments). Input parameters that have been used to model the long range transport potential for HFPO-DA are summarised in Table 8. This resulted in an estimated of CTD = 5728 km and a \(P_{ov} = 132\) days for HFPO-DA (using the vP criteria in the calculations), a CTD = 7634 km and a \(P_{ov} = 270\) days (using water and soil half lives of one year) up to a CTD of 8890 km and a \(P_{ov} = 400\) days (using water and soil half lives of three years).

#### Table 8: Input parameters used to model the long range transport potential for HFPO-DA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value used in the modelling</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\log D) at pH 7</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>(\log D) value from the registration dossier of HFPO-DA, EC number: 700-242-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\log K_{aw})</td>
<td>-2.857</td>
<td>estimated with the HenryWin v3.21 – April 2015 – software, as developed by the US-EPA ((\log K_{aw} = -2.077)) and adjusted for ionization*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric degradation half-life</td>
<td>20.6 days (494 hours)</td>
<td>calculated using the AOPWin v1.93 – April 2015 - software, developed by the US-EPA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^8\) 494.4 hours, as calculated using the AOPWin v1.93 – April 2015 - software, developed by the US-EPA

Parameter | Value used in the modelling | Comments
--- | --- | ---
Water half life | 60 days (1440 hours) up to 3 years (26280 hours) | the vP criterion for water, and a less optimistic value of 1 and 3 years.
Soil half life | 180 days (4320 hours) up to 3 years (26280 hours) | the vP criterion for soil, and a less optimistic value of 1 and 3 years.
Molecular weight | 330.06 g/mol | Neutral acid form of HFPO-DA

* log $K_{aw}$ is corrected by the same amount as the log D correction (2.58) from log $K_{ow}$ (3.36, KOWWIN v1.68 estimate), using the relation log $K_{aw} = \log K_{ow} - \log K_{oa}$, and assuming the octanol-air partition coefficient does not change.

A characteristic travel distance (CTD) of 5728 km estimated with water and soil half lives at the vP criterion already indicates that HFPO-DA (or any other substance with similar physico-chemical properties) can reach any area in the world before any significant amount of substance degradation has occurred. The estimated overall persistency of 132 days suggests that the substance is not expected to reside a significant amount of time in the atmospheric compartment, as this would lead to an overall persistence estimate closer to the 20 days estimated for the atmospheric half-life. Current fate modelling suggests the water compartment to be the main residence compartment.

The detailed information on the calculations from the OECD LRTP-tool estimations for HFPO-DA, given in Annex I confirm this. If emissions are only to the water compartment, 94% of the total emission volume is estimated to end up in the water compartment at equilibrium state. Also clearly visible from the detailed calculation results is that the soil compartment only becomes relevant when emissions are directly to soil (leading to 69% of the total emission volume staying in the soil, if soil is the only compartment to which emission occurs). With emissions to air and/or water, the soil compartment will not be of any significance (0.4% and 0.07% of the total emission volume respectively) for environmental concentrations of HFPO-DA. Once the substance is emitted to water, it is very likely to stay in the water compartment for a very long time. Even if the emissions are to air only, the fate modeling indicates that still 69% of the emission volume will end up in the water compartment.

![Figure 11](https://example.com/figure11.png)

**Figure 11**: Characteristic Travel Distance (CTD) and overall persistence (Pov) of HFPO-DA and polychlorinated biphenyls as reference substances. The line represents the model boundary (i.e. the maximum value of the CTD that can be calculated at any given Pov. HFPO-DA CTD estimates are closer to the model maximum boundary lines than the estimates for the PCBs, indicating that the Long Range Transport Potential of HFPO-DA exceeds that of the already identified POPs like PCBs.

Figure 11 shows the graphical output for the calculated CTD and Pov for HFPO-DA (red dot) and a set of generic polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) homologues, which act as reference substances (blue squares). The estimated overall persistence in the environment is higher for the PCBs. This
reflects the optimistic choice of environmental half-lives (water, soil) using the half-life criterion for very Persistent (vP) substances. The actual half-lives for HFPO-DA in the environment are expected to well exceed this criterion, leading to longer estimated \( P_{\text{ow}} \), and an increase in the CTD as well.

Substances with CTD and \( P_{\text{ow}} \) values in the order of magnitude modelled here for HFPO-DA are expected to show very high long-range transport potential, identical to or exceeding e.g. the LRTP of PCBs which have been detected in remote areas like the polar regions. The solid line shown in Figure 11 represents the theoretical maximum CTD for any given \( P_{\text{ow}} \). It shows that the estimate for HFPO-DA is closer to this theoretical maximum than any of the PCBs. Assuming that the environmental half-life of HFPO-DA is roughly identical to PCB half-life would subsequently give a higher CTD estimate for HFPO-DA than for the PCBs. Based on these modelling results it is possible that HFPO-DA has an even higher capacity for Long Range Transport in the environment than known POP-substances like PCBs.

These estimations for HFPO-DA should be considered with some reservations: the QSAR estimations of the physico-chemical properties for HFPO-DA in the OECD LRTP tool \((K_{\text{aw}} \text{ and } K_{\text{ow}})\) are known to be difficult to predict using QSAR models. This makes these estimations less reliable. However, measuring a representative value (for fate modelling) will be difficult as well. But the general trend of the modelling results is clear and not very dependent on the choice of the (boundaries) of the relevant parameters like persistence in the different compartments. Even with lower boundary estimates the properties of HFPO-DA already give rise to clear long range transport potential. The modelling results are also nicely in line with the monitoring data that indicate that HFPO-DA is found, and will stay mainly in the aquatic compartment, but even then is able to be transported to very remote areas from the emission sources. When persistence is increased to more realistic values of several years (in the water and soil compartment) this behavior becomes only more notable.

In a publication by Gomis et al. (2015), a comparison of the (modeled) long range transport potential of HFPO-DA, PFOA, PFOS and a number of PFOA alternatives is presented, also using the OECD LRTP tool. Although the choice of values for environmental half-lives is very different (HFPO-DA as well as PFOA and PFOS are estimated to be much more persistent than the "best case" values used in the analysis presented here), the analysis clearly concludes that the long range transport behaviour of HFPO-DA will not be significantly different than for PFOA, indicating that HFPO-DA has a very strong potential for long range transport.

### 3.4 Bioaccumulation

#### 3.4.1 Bioaccumulation in aquatic organisms (pelagic & sediment organisms)

This section summarizes the bioaccumulation of HFPO-DA in fish. Data on the bioaccumulation potential of HFPO-DA in humans and mammalian species, including half-lives and toxicokinetics, is presented in Section 4.1. Similar to the accumulation in humans and mammals, accumulation in fish is not expected to be via accumulation in lipids. The ECHA dissemination website makes reference to an in vitro test with the ammonium salt of HFPO-DA incubated for 4 hours with rainbow trout hepatocytes. The test shows that the substance is not metabolised (no further details given). Some in vivo data are available on the bioaccumulation potential for HFPO-DA in fish. These data indicate that bioconcentration factors (BCF) and bioaccumulation factors (BAF) are low. Similar to the environmental monitoring data, the field bioaccumulation data are from peer-reviewed publications, often with emphasis on the methodological development of the analysis of PFASs or from laboratories with certified test protocols. The reliability of the data is thus considered high.

A laboratory BCF study was performed, in which carp were exposed to 0.2 and 0.02 mg FRD-903 (CAS# 13252-13-6)/L (Hoke et al. 2016). HFPO-DA could not be detected in fish at these two concentrations (<0.55 mg/kg), which resulted in BCF values <3 (at 0.2 mg/L) and <30 L/kg (at 0.02 mg/L). It should be noted that although the study is further reliable, the reporting limit is rather high in comparison with the field data described below.
A laboratory study with common carp investigated the bioconcentration in carp in a flow-through study with a range of different exposure concentrations, ranging from 10 ng/L to 100 µg/L (Goodband, 2019). The test item was GX903 (FRD903), which is the acid form with a purity of 96.97%. The uptake phase lasted 36 days, the depuration phase 28 days. The study was performed under GLP according to TG OECD 305. However, several shortcomings in the study could be identified. First, the analysis of especially fish concentrations was hampered by the low concentrations employed in the study. Further, a significant cross-contamination was observed, with the water concentrations of the control even exceeding the lowest test concentration and close to the second test concentration. The water concentrations at the lower two test concentrations were not maintained within ±20% of the mean measured concentrations. Average measured water concentrations were 313, 77, 83, 79, and 89% of nominal for the increasing test concentrations. The reported steady-state BCF values were 8, 7, 2, 1, and 1 L/kg for the increasing nominal exposure concentrations of 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10 and 100 µg/L. These were based on the concentrations in fish sampled on day 36 of the the uptake phase. The concentrations in fish were rather variable, however, and showed a decline in the last time point. Although it is stated in the report that kinetic BCFs can not be calculated due to the limited uptake, a fit of the data will include not only the last point in the uptake phase, but all data. Therefore, the data were fitted for the purpose of this dossier on basis of all data. Some time points were only included in the figures. The resulting BCF values are 21, 8.9, 1.6, 0.9 and 0.9 L/kg, respectively. The recalculated BCF values are higher than those reported in the study mainly because of the higher concentration in the intermediate time points of day 13 and 21 in the 0.010 and 0.10 µg/L test concentrations. In the report this is explained as a result of the complex analytical method and low levels being analysed. However, analytical issues at low concentrations would affect the higher concentrations not more than the lower ones (if resolution of chromatographic peaks is an issue). Moreover, it also does not explained why the concentrations in fish after 3 days of depuration are also higher than the concentrations at the end of the exposure period in these two lowest exposure concentrations. Another remarkable finding is that the BCF calculated for the cross-contaminated control group (10 L/kg) matches the BCF for the 0.1 µg/L exposure concentration (8.9 L/kg) quite closely. For the contaminated control group and the second test concentration the aqueous exposure concentrations are similar as well. For these reasons, the fish concentrations at the end of the exposure period are not considered more reliable than the preceeding time points. The BCFs determined by taking all data into account are considered more reliable, although it is acknowledged that the analytical issues do have a negative impact on the reliability of the BCF values. However, BCF values reported in the study as well as recalculated from the presented data are low, but increase with decreasing exposure concentrations. A BCF obtained at a high exposure concentration, should thus not be used to calculate the concentration in fish at lower environmentally relevant concentrations.

In a Chinese field study with fish sampling conducted downstream of a fluorochemical manufacturing site (Pan et al. 2017), HFPO-DA was detected in muscle of carp (n = 15) with a median concentration of 0.00153 mg/kg at a median concentration of 369 ng/L in water. This results in an average BAF of 4.1 L/kg. In the same study, a BAF for PFOA of 2.9 L/kg was found. In this study by Pan et al. (2017), the external water concentration of PFOA was much higher than that of HFPO-DA, namely 23150 ng/L for PFOA vs. 369 ng/L for HFPO-DA.

HFPO-DA was also detected in muscle of carp from a small lake in the city of Helmond (The Netherlands), known to have a local pollution. Sampling was in June 2018. The concentration HFPO-DA in carp muscle was 0.0047 mg/kg, while the concentration of PFOA was 0.0013 mg/kg. The water concentrations found in this lake were 15000 ng/L for HFPO-DA and 2300 ng/L for PFOA (NVWA, 2018). Based on these data, the BAF values are 0.31 L/kg for HFPO-DA and 0.57 L/kg for PFOA. The water concentrations of the same lake were also sampled 9 days before the simultaneous sampling of carp and water mentioned above. The concentrations found were 6800 ng/L for HFPO-DA and 4900 ng/L for PFOA (Van Bentum et al., 2018). Based on geometric means for the water concentrations, the BAF values are 0.47 L/kg for HFPO-DA and 0.39 L/kg for PFOA.

Fish and water were monitored in Marsh Wood Lake, which is a small private-owned lake, slightly over 1 km north of the fluorochemical plant in North Carolina (NCDEQ, 2018c, NCDEQ and NCDHHS Science Advisory Board, 2018). In this study 33 PFASs were investigated. The measured water concentration for HFPO-DA was 968 ng/L. The filets of three species of fish were analysed for
PFAS, which were blue catfish, redbear sunfish and largemouth bass (two sizes). Only HFPO-DA, PFOS and the longer chain PFCAs (C11-C14) could be detected in fish. PFOS was detected in all species, the C11-C14 PFCAs only in largemouth bass and HFPO-DA only in redbear sunfish. The concentrations of HFPO-DA in filet of redbear sunfish was 0.27 µg/kg fresh weight. This results in a BAF value of 0.28 L/kg. Limits of detection/quantification (LOD/LOQ) are not given in the presented results, but presumably BAF values in the other species will be lower.

For PFOA, it has been observed that the bioaccumulation is dependent on the exposure levels (Verbruggen et al, 2017). Given its structural similarity, it is likely that the bioaccumulation of HFPO-DA follows a similar pattern. The bioconcentration study for HFPO-DA seems to confirm this hypothesis. Other data for BCF and BAF of PFOA in common carp (Verbruggen et al., 2017) show that the BAF values for PFOA are higher than what as observed for HFPO-DA at similar external water concentrations, see Figure 12.

Because the bioaccumulation of HFPO-DA seems concentration dependent in a similar way as is observed for PFOA, it could be possible that the accumulation of other PFASs in fish might influence the accumulation of PFOA and HFPO-DA. The water concentrations of PFOA observed in the field studies cited by Verbruggen et al. (2017) were always amongst the highest of the studied PFASs (roughly about half of the total concentration of PFASs or more). In contrast, in the study by Pan et al. (2017), the aqueous concentration of HFPO-DA had only a minor contribution to the sum of PFASs. Total PFAS concentrations in fish from the study by Pan et al. (2017) were almost 50 times higher than for HFPO-DA. Still, the calculated BAF does quite well fit in with the data from the BCF study in which HFPO-DA was the only test substance. Also in the lake from North Carolina, other PFASs had higher concentrations compared to HFPO-DA. The highest PFAS concentrations were found in those fish species in which HFPO-DA was not detected (NCDEQ, 2018c). In this lake the BAF values for HFPO-DA were indeed considerably lower than the BCF values with common carp at similar concentrations.
For the BAF values from the lake in the Netherlands, a similar effect seems to occur for PFOA. In this small lake, HFPO-DA has the higher concentrations in water and in fish, and the BAF value for PFOA is much lower than expected. The bioaccumulation factors might thus be influenced by the presence of other PFASs.

From the available data from the BCF study with common carp performed at several concentrations in combination with a few field BAFs, it seems that the BCF/BAF values for the same species (common carp) for similar concentrations are about a factor of 3 (0.5 log unit) higher for PFOA than for HFPO-DA. Some uncertainty still exists because the reliability of the BCF values at the lower concentrations is not very high. Further, also the effect of the joint exposure of PFAS on bioaccumulation is not fully resolved.

### 3.4.2 Summary and discussion of bioaccumulation

Due to the high solubility of HFPO-DA, bioaccumulation in fish is low. Based on the structural similarities it can be expected that bioaccumulation factors are higher at low environmental concentrations, similar to PFOA. Although bioaccumulation is still low at these environmental concentrations, fish consumption could be a relevant exposure route for humans as it is for PFOA.

### 3.5 Enrichments in plants

Monitoring data of HFPO-DA in vegetables and fruits have been collected from kitchen gardens in the vicinity of the fluorochemical plant near Dordrecht in the Netherlands in August 2017 (Mengelers et al., 2017). The 10 locations were within 1 km of the plant (n=2), 1–2 km from the plant (n=6), 2–3 km from the plant (n=1) and 3–4 km from the plant (n=1). Further, a reference location was chosen about 50 km from the plant. The sampled vegetables and fruits included tomatoes, celery, beets, endive, zucchini, lettuce, cucumber, pumpkin, potatoes, apples, bell peppers, carrots, and pears. The edible parts of vegetables and fruits were analysed both unwashed and washed or peeled. Besides HFPO-DA also PFOA was analysed. For HFPO-DA the limit of detection (LOD) was 0.5 ng/g_{fwt} and the limit of quantification (LOQ) 1.0 ng/g_{fwt}. The same LOQ was applicable to PFOA, but the LOD of PFOA was 0.4 ng/g_{fwt} for potatoes and 0.1 ng/g_{fwt} for the rest.

At the reference location neither PFOA nor HFPO-DA could be detected. Of the 74 samples originating from locations near the fluorochemical plant, HFPO-DA was below the LOD in 45 cases, between the LOD and LOQ in 29 cases and above the LOQ in 10 cases. For PFOA these numbers were 44, 27, and 3. Highest concentrations for HFPO-DA were measured in the two nearest locations, northeast of the fluorochemical plant. Washing significantly reduced the concentrations of HFPO-DA. The concentrations were significantly different for different types of vegetables with leafy vegetables having the highest concentrations, followed by tuber vegetables and fruit vegetables. The highest concentration for unwashed vegetables was 5.4 ng/g_{fwt} for lettuce, while the highest concentration for washed vegetables was 3.0 ng/g_{fwt} for tomatoes (Mengelers et al., 2017).

In a follow-up research to Mengelers et al. (2017), soil samples were taken from exactly the same locations in March 2018 (Van Poll, 2018). The HFPO-DA concentrations in soil varied from <0.1 (LOQ) to 1.0 ng/g_{dwt}. For PFOA the concentrations were between 0.3 and 7.7 ng/g_{dwt}. These soil samples were not taken at the time the vegetables were sampled. Other soil samples from the area of Dordrecht taken in February and March 2018 had slightly higher concentrations for HFPO-DA, varying from 0.18 to 4.7 ng/g_{dwt} (Van Bentum et al., 2017), but in the same order of magnitude. If plant concentrations are compared to soil concentrations it appears that the ratio between plants and soil is much higher for HFPO-DA than for PFOA, due to the higher concentrations of HFPO-DA in plants and the higher concentrations of PFOA in soil.

On the basis of these data, a ratio between plants and soil can be calculated to investigate the transfer from soil to plants. For this purpose, only data for washed and/or peeled (in the case of tuber vegetables, pumpkins and fruit) were used to exclude the possible contribution of air deposition. To deal with the samples between the LOD and between the LOD and LOQ, these values were set at half the LOD (0.25 ng/g_{fwt}) and the average of LOD and LOQ (0.75 ng/g_{fwt}).
respectively. For the four locations with the highest concentrations in vegetables and fruits, which all had soil concentrations above the LOQ, the following geometric mean BAF values were derived: 0.83 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for all vegetables and fruit, 0.57 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for fruit vegetables, 1.62 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for leaf vegetables, 0.72 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for tuber and root vegetables, and 0.92 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for fruit. If all locations were taken into account instead of the four with the highest concentrations in vegetables and fruits, values would be higher, but this is mainly due to the number of samples below the LOQ and LOD.

On another location in Helmond in the Netherlands with kitchen gardens near a company that processed Teflon, vegetables were sampled in September 2018 (Boon et al., 2019). Additionally, soil was sampled in November 2018 (data not published in the report). The vegetables that were sampled included potatoes, beets, celery, kale, cucumber, bell pepper, rhubarb, lettuce, green beans, onion, and carrots. Mixed samples for both soil and vegetables were analysed. In this study the LOQ was 0.1 ng/g\textsubscript{dwt} for soil and 0.1 ng/g\textsubscript{fwt} for vegetables, for both HFPO-DA and PFOA. Only 4 out of 21 samples for HFPO-DA in vegetables were below the LOQ. For PFOA the number of samples below the LOQ was 12. The concentration in soil was determined in three spots at three different depths: 0-20 cm, 20-50 cm and 100-150 cm. Although there were no significant differences, the concentrations of HFPO-DA tend to increase with increasing depth, 1.58 ± 1.10, 1.95 ± 1.30 and 2.83 ± 1.58 ng/g\textsubscript{dwt}, respectively. For PFOA, the reversed situation was observed, the highest concentrations were observed in the top layer. The concentrations in the three layers were 12.3 ± 1.0, 10.8 ± 2.1 and 0.8 ± 0.17 ng/g\textsubscript{dwt}, respectively. Given the fact that the HFPO-DA deposition on the soil was more recent, this is indicative of the high mobility of HFPO-DA towards the deeper soil layers. A ratio between plants and soil can be calculated in a similar way as for the other location. To deal with the samples below the LOQ, these values were set at half the LOQ (0.05 ng/g\textsubscript{fwt}). For the soil concentrations, the geometric mean of concentrations for the top layer was used. The following geometric mean BAF values were derived: 0.48 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for all vegetables, 0.72 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for fruit vegetables, 0.69 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for leaf vegetables, 0.18 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for tuber and root vegetables. It can be concluded that these BAF values are in the same range as the ones determined for the other locations in the vicinity of Dordrecht.

Grass and leaves from plants were sampled on 5 locations within 3 km northeast of the fluorochemical plant in Dordrecht (NL) in August 2016 (Brandsma et al., 2019). The concentrations of HFPO-DA were the highest of the analysed PFASs, followed by PFOA. The HFPO-DA concentrations in grass varied from 1.0 to 27 ng/g\textsubscript{fwt}, with a geometric mean value of 5.2 ng/g\textsubscript{fwt}. Leaves from the plants hawthorn, raspberry, silver birch, ash and plane had HFPO-DA concentrations of 86, 13, 28, 16, 4, 3 and <0.3 ng/g\textsubscript{fwt}, respectively. Concentrations in both grass and leaves generally decreased with increasing distance to the plant. HFPO-DA concentrations were below the LOD (<0.1 ng/g\textsubscript{fwt}) in grass and leaves of plane from Amsterdam, which is about 85 kilometers to the north of Dordrecht. Concentrations in this study were much higher than the concentration in the fruit and vegetables from the kitchen gardens from the same area. However, these samples were from one year earlier and were not washed. Besides that, these plants are not suitable for consumption.

BAF values for PFOA, calculated from the same studies, are much lower in both cases. Geometric BAF values were below 0.1 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt}. Uptake experiments with a series of PFCAs and PFSAs have been performed in several soils with lettuce and tomatoes (Blaine et al., 2013, Blaine et al., 2014). BAF values decreased with increasing chain length of the PFCAs and PFSAs. Moreover, PFCAs had higher BAF values than PFSAs. As the concentrations in these studies are expressed on a dry weight basis instead of a fresh weight basis, the BAF values for HFPO-DA and PFOA from the field studies from the Netherlands have to be multiplied by approximately a factor of 20 for a direct comparison with these BAF values (water content of tomatoes, celery and lettuce is about 95%).

On a dry weight basis, the estimated BAFs for HFPO-DA were ~28 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{dwt} for washed celery, <69, <100 and 52 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for washed lettuce and <13, <69 and 85 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for washed tomatoes for the samples from the vicinity of Dordrecht. For the samples from Helmond, the BAFs were <1.5 and 10 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for lettuce and 12 and 38 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for tomatoes. On the same basis, the estimated BAFs for PFOA were <0.63 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{dwt} for washed celery, <0.56, <0.68, <3.6 and ~8.5 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{dwt} for washed lettuce and <0.63, <6.9, ~3.1 and ~8.5 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for washed tomatoes for the samples from the vicinity of Dordrecht, and <0.16 and 0.31 g\textsubscript{dwt}/g\textsubscript{fwt} for lettuce and <0.16...
and 0.19 g<sub>dwt</sub>/g<sub>dwt</sub> for tomatoes from Helmond.

While BAF values for PFOA from the studies by Blaine et al. are comparable with the calculated BAFs for the locations in the Netherlands (with the exception of two samples for tomatoes from the vicinity of Dordrecht, which were between LOD and LOQ), the BAF values for HFPO-DA from the Netherlands are comparable with BAF values for the short-chain PFCAs such as PFBA and PFHxA from the studies by Blain et al. These BAF values reflect the mobile character of these substances, also in terrestrial plants. Further, it appears that compared to PFOA, the transfer from soil to plants is much higher for HFPO-DA. The accumulation of HFPO-DA in plants can also be compared to other organic substances. Hurtado et al. (2016) determined the concentration of eight chemicals in leaf of lettuce and in the artificial soil (perlite and sand), in which they were grown in a greenhouse experiment. The tested substances were mostly neutral, except for ibuprofen and propranolol. Bisphenol-A, caffeine, propranolol and tonalide had BAF values that ranged between 2.3 and 9.1 g<sub>dwt</sub>/g<sub>dwt</sub>. Ibuprofen and triclosan had a maximum BAF value of 1.3 g<sub>dwt</sub>/g<sub>dwt</sub>, while sulfamethazine was not detected in plants. Carbamazepine had high BAF values ranging from 17 to 247 g<sub>dwt</sub>/g<sub>dwt</sub>, which exceeds those of the other tested substances and HFPO-DA in the field studies from the Netherlands. HFPO-DA has higher or at least comparable BAFs as the substances bisphenol-A, caffeine, propranolol and tonalide, and higher BAFs than ibuprofen, triclosan and sulfamethazine.

It should be noted that HFPO-DA is not strongly adsorbed to soil and therefore, a BCF from pore water would be more illustrative of the bioaccumulation. However, these data are not available.

Due to the observed uptake in vegetables and fruits, consumption of these by plant-eating wildlife and humans can contribute significantly to the total exposure to HFPO-DA.

### 3.6 Summary on the concern for bioavailability

The limited information available on HFPO-DA in plants, fish, ground water and drinking water presented in sections 3.2.5, 3.4 and 3.5 support the concern that HFPO-DA can be bioavailable for humans and that exposure may take place via food and drinking water. The available data on HFPO-DA in the blood of workers (the Netherlands) and citizens living in the proximity of a plant where HFPO-DA is being processed (China) provides evidence that HFPO-DA is taken up by the human body and hence that internal exposure takes place. The fact that HFPO-DA is not found in citizens in the US that had a long term historical exposure to HFPO-DA, and is also not found in several other studies looking at HFPO-DA concentrations in fish and terrestrial animals, does not refute this concern. The study from the US shows that the route through which exposure occurs is largely unknown, while the monitoring data from biota at more remote places merely supports the hypothesis that HFPO-DA is currently spreading in the environment and has not yet reached background levels that lead to worldwide detectable serum or biota concentrations.
4 Human health hazard assessment

Availability of data sources

For HFPO-DA, a considerable number of studies is available via the REACH Registration Dossier of FRD-902. Moreover, details from the original study reports for FRD-902 (which largely contain the same studies as the REACH registration dossier) and details from the original study reports for FRD-903, published via the Health and Research Online (HERO) database of the US-EPA, are used in this section. Other than that, six scientific publications and two scientific reports are available in the public literature that describe the mammalian toxicity of HFPO-DA (Wang et al., 2017, Gannon et al., 2016, Caverly Rae et al., 2015, Sheng et al., 2018, Rushing et al., 2017, Li et al., 2019, US-EPA, 2018, Beekman et al., 2016).

For the toxicokinetics of the HFPO-DA, three *in vitro* and seven *in vivo* studies are available that specifically looked at the ADME (absorption, metabolism, distribution, and elimination) of HFPO-DA. Furthermore, five repeated dose studies also contain information on blood serum, tissue, and/or urine concentrations, and therefore are also taken into account in the ADME section. Additionally, three publications on biomonitoring of HFPO-DA in human serum are described (Pan et al., 2017, NCDHHS, 2018, Van den Berg, 2017).

For acute toxicity of FRD-902, three oral studies in the mouse and rat, one inhalatory study in the rat, and two dermal studies in the rat and rabbit are present. One study observed the oral acute toxicity of FRD-903. Furthermore, one *in vitro* corrosion study is present for FRD-903, and one *in vivo* skin irritation study for FRD-902. Two studies observed the skin sensitisation potential of FRD-902. No studies are available for respiratory sensitisation. Five *in vitro* mutagenicity studies and three *in vivo* mutagenicity studies are available for FRD-902. Except for the dermal acute toxicity test in rabbits, all studies are performed according to OECD guidelines.

With regard to repeated dose toxicity, four oral 7 days exposure studies are available, two target organ toxicity studies in mice exposed to FRD-902 and FRD-903, and two screening studies in rats exposed to FRD-902 and FRD-903. These studies are not conducted according to OECD guidelines. In general, 7 days exposure studies are not considered to be highly relevant to observe repeated organ toxicity. Moreover, two oral 28 days repeated dose studies are available for FRD-902 in rat and mouse, two oral 90 days repeated dose studies are available for FRD-902 in rat and mouse, and one oral combined chronic toxicity/carcinogenicity study is available for FRD-902 in the rat. Last, two oral prenatal developmental studies in rats (one full study and one conformational study), and one combined reproductive/developmental screening study in mice is available. All studies are conducted according to OECD guidelines.

One remark should be that several of the repeated-dose toxicity studies have either large dose intervals (Haas, 2008a, Haas, 2009, Craig, 2013) or may be considered not to induce sufficient toxicity at the highest dose level studied\(^\text{11}\) (Nabb, 2008a, Nabb, 2008d, Mackenzie, 2010, Edwards, 2010a). As a result, the doses used in these studies are useful to determine a NOAEL or BMD but do not serve the purpose of illustrating the toxicity of the substance within the critical window for hazard assessment (e.g. doses are either far below or far above the cut-off point for STOT RE2 classification). To overcome this issue, dose-response modelling was performed to gain information on the toxicity of the substance between the dose intervals, and to an acceptable degree above the highest dose tested.

Recently, the US-EPA (2018) conducted a health hazard assessment for substances used in the GenX technology, with the aim to derive oral subchronic and chronic reference doses. Although

---

\(^{\text{11}}\) According to the latest version of OECD TG 408 and OECD TG 421, “the highest dose level should be chosen with the aim to induce toxicity but not death or severe suffering” and “a descending sequence of dose levels should be selected with a view to demonstrating any dosage related response and a NOAEL at the lowest dose level.”


their current report is published for public review purposes and does not represent the US-EPA policy at this current state, the preliminary conclusions of the Agency are in line with those presented in this Support Document.

All studies and publications are considered relevant to evaluate the mammalian toxicity of HFPO-DA, and are used in the weight of evidence for hazard assessment. Despite the fact that some studies are not conducted according to OECD guidelines, or may not be considered highly relevant as stand-alone studies to observe repeated dose toxicity (i.e. 7 days studies), the study results show an overall consistent pattern of toxicity for HFPO-DA. Hence, there is no reason to discard any study on the basis of reliability.

4.1 Toxicokinetics (absorption, metabolism, distribution and elimination)

4.1.1 Non-human information

4.1.1.1 Absorption

Oral

Data indicate that HFPO-DA is readily absorbed in the gastrointestinal tract (Fasano, 2011b, Fasano, 2011a). Five Crl:CD(SD) rats of each sex were administered with a single dose of 30 mg/kg/bw FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water) (Fasano, 2011b). Urine was collected and pooled for the first 12 hours and 12-168 hours. Data illustrate that a mean percentage of 95% or 97% of the administered dose was excreted in the urine during the first twelve hours post-exposure for female and male rats respectively. Similarly, five Crl:CD-1(ICR) mice of each sex were administered with a single dose of 3 mg/kg/bw FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water) (Fasano, 2011a). Urine was collected and pooled for the first 12 hours and 12-168 hours. Data illustrate that a mean percentage of 31% and 39% of the administered dose was excreted in the urine during the first twelve hours post-exposure for male and female mice. By 168 hours, 90% and 92% of the administered dose was retrieved in the urine respectively. These studies indicate that both mice and rats absorb almost the entire administered dose FRD-902 via the gastrointestinal tract, but mice either absorb or excrete HFPO-DA at a slower rate than rats.

Rushing et al. (2017) exposed groups (N = 6) of male and female (C57BL/6) mice to FRD-903 by gavage at doses of 1, 10, or 100 mg/kg bw/day for 28 days. Serum concentrations were measured at days 1, 5, 14, and 28 and urine concentrations were measured at days 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, and 14. Serum concentrations were significantly different from control at all time points for the 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day groups, but not for the 1 mg/kg bw/day groups. Maximum serum concentrations were reached at day 5 for all groups, after which they dropped again with exemption of the 100 mg/kg bw/day dosed males, for which maximum concentrations remained until 14 days of exposure. Overall, males showed higher serum concentrations as well as urine concentrations at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day compared to females at all time points, suggesting higher absorption in male mice.

In the oral mouse 90-day study (MacKenzie, 2010) according to OECD TG 408, groups of 10 Crl:CD-1(ICR) mice per dose and sex were exposed to FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water) at dose levels of 0, 0.1, 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day. Additional animals were exposed for evaluation of the plasma concentration of the substance at 2 hours after exposure on day 0, 28 and 95. LOD and LOQ were 5 ng/mL and 20 ng/mL respectively. The serum concentration 2 hours after the first exposure (Table 9) illustrates the absorption after the first gavage exposure. Serum concentrations increased in a dose-dependent manner and illustrated differences between individual animals (indicated by a large SD). The sex difference in absorption observed by Rushing et al. (2017) is not reflected by these data.

Table 9: Plasma concentration in mice 2 hours after exposure (gavage) to FRD-902 (MacKenzie, 2010).
Dermal

Skin absorption for FRD-902 was observed using human and rat skin mounted in an in vitro static diffusion cell at a concentration of 124 mg/mL, according to OECD TG 428 (DuPont, 2008). In rat skin, a lag time of 0.82 ± 0.77 h was observed and in human skin the observed lag time was 1.73 ± 1.01 h. Steady state penetration was 70.3± 5.3 μg/cm²/h and 6.2 ± 5.3 μg/cm²/h for rats and humans respectively, leading to dermal permeability coefficients (Kp) of 5.71E-4 ± 4.3E-5 cm/h and 5.02E-5 ± 4.3E-5 cm/h respectively. These results indicate that FRD-902 penetrates the skin, but on a relatively slower rate than chemicals that are well-absorbed by the skin.

4.1.1.2 Distribution

Generally, data in rats and mice indicate that HFPO-DA distributes mainly to the serum/plasma and the liver, at higher concentrations in males compared to females.

Three (Crl:CD(SD)) rats of each sex were administered a single dose of FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water) at 10 or 30 mg/kg bw respectively (Gannon, 2008b). Plasma samples were collected at 0, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8, 12, 24, 48, 72, 96, 120, 144, and 168 hours post-exposure. Furthermore, liver and adipose tissue were collected after sacrifice. Plasma and tissue LOQs were approximately 20 ng/mL and 20 ng/g respectively. The results showed that at 10 mg/kg bw and 30 mg/kg bw, the mean concentrations in the liver were 73 ng/g and 38 ng/g for males and below LOQ (highest value 54 ng/g) and below LOQ for females. Mean plasma concentrations at 10 mg/kg bw and 30 mg/kg bw were 36 ng/mL and 57 ng/mL for males and below LOQ for females. This corresponded to liver tissue to plasma concentration ratios of 2.2 ± 1.1 and 0.8 ± 0.3 for males in the low and high dose groups. Ratios were not calculated for females as there were no plasma concentrations above LOQ. In adipose tissue, no HFPO-DA was found at concentrations above LOQ.

The same procedure was performed for (Crl:CD(SD)) rats administered with one single dose of FRD-903 at either 10 or 30 mg/kg bw (Gannon, 2008c). Plasma and tissue LOQs were approximately 20 ng/mL and 20 ng/g respectively. The results showed that at 10 mg/kg bw and 30 mg/kg bw, the mean concentrations in the liver were 24 ng/g and 89 ng/g for males and below LOQ for females. Mean plasma concentrations for males were 41 ng/mL and 128 ng/mL and below LOQ for females. This corresponded to liver tissue to plasma concentration ratios of 0.6 ± 0.3 and 0.7 ± 0.2 for males in the low and high dose groups. Ratios were not calculated for females as there were no liver tissue concentrations above LOQ. In adipose tissue, no HFPO-DA was found at concentrations above LOQ.

Also for mice the tissue distribution was evaluated. Three Crl:CD-1(ICR) mice of each sex were administered with a single dose of FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water) at 10 or 30 mg/kg bw respectively (Gannon, 2008a). Plasma samples were collected at 0, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8, 12, 24, 48, 72, 96, 120, 144, and 168 hours post-exposure. Furthermore, liver and adipose tissue were collected after sacrifice. Plasma and tissue LOQs were approximately 20 ng/mL and 20 ng/g respectively. The results showed that at 10 mg/kg bw and 30 mg/kg bw, the mean concentrations in the liver were 384 ng/g and 457 ng/g for males and below LOQ for females. This corresponded to liver tissue to plasma concentration ratios of 0.5 ± 0 and 0.6 ± 0.1 for males in the low and high dose groups. Ratios were not calculated for females as there were no liver tissue concentrations above LOQ. In adipose tissue, no HFPO-DA was found at concentrations above LOQ.

Gestational transfer and transfer via lactation

In a reproductive/developmental toxicity screening study according to OECD TG 421, Crl:CD-1(ICR) mice (N = 25) were exposed by oral gavage at dose levels of 0, 0.1, 0.5 and 5 mg FRD-902/kg bw/day (purity 84%) (Edwards, 2010a). The F0 males were dosed during study days 0 to
84 (70 days prior to pairing through 1 day prior to euthanasia), for a total of 84 to 85 doses. The females that were selected for toxicokinetic evaluation were dosed through the day of euthanasia (lactation day 21) for a total of 54 to 65 doses. Plasma HFPO-DA LOD was 3 ng/mL.

The plasma levels of HFPO-DA in pups on post-natal day (PND) 4 were 2-4 fold below the PND 21 maternal levels and on PND 21 the plasma levels were 40-60 fold lower (Table 10 and Table 11). This illustrates that HFPO-DA is transferred to the pups, either through gestation, lactation, or through both. Furthermore, plasma levels in pups retrieved on PND 21 were 10-32 times lower than the concentrations in pups on PND 4. This decline illustrates negligible transfer via lactation. On PND 40, after direct gavage exposure of the F1 for a consecutive 20 doses of 0, 0.1, 0.5 or 5 mg/kg bw/day, the plasma levels were comparable between the dams and offspring, showing relatively higher mean concentrations in F1 males compared to F1 females.

**Table 10**: Maternal plasma levels (ng/mL) at lactation day 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>LD 21 mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;LOD</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4966</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36420</td>
<td>5545</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11**: Plasma levels (ng/mL) in mouse pups on PND 2, 21 and 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PND 4</th>
<th>PND 21</th>
<th>PND 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male</td>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11265</td>
<td>3885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = not available

A developmental toxicity study (developmental toxicity/teratogenicity) was conducted in rats, according to OECD TG 414 (Munley, 2011, Edwards, 2010b). Pregnant Crl:CD(SD) rats were exposed to FRD-902 (84% purity) at 0, 5, 10, 100, or 1000 mg/kg bw/day by oral gavage during Gestation days (GD) 6-20. Dams were sacrificed on GD 21. Plasma concentrations were measured in the foetuses on GD 20, in dams on GD 20, and additionally in dams on GD 6 in the highest exposure group (1000 mg/kg bw/day). The LOD and LOQ were 0.7 and 3 ng/mL respectively.

The plasma concentration in foetuses (pooled concentration) was approximately one-third of the plasma concentration in the dam at GD20 (Table 12). These data indicate gestational transfer from dam to the fetus, in line with the elevated plasma concentrations in the mouse pups at PND 4 (as observed in the OECD TG 421 study).

**Table 12**: Plasma levels (ng/mL) of dams (GD 6 and GD 20) and pups (GD 20), N = 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Dams GD 6</th>
<th>Dams GD 20</th>
<th>Pups (pooled) GD 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>85560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>338400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>430600</td>
<td>162712</td>
<td>348400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = not available
4.1.1.3 Metabolism

In an in vitro study using male and female rat hepatocytes was screened for potential formation of metabolites (Nabb, 2007). Incubated hepatocytes (1 x 10^6 cells/mL) were treated with FRD-902 at a concentration of 10 μL/mL, and samples were evaluated at 0, 30, 45, 60, 90, and 120 minutes. No metabolites were detected.

A similar in vitro study was carried out using trout hepatocytes (DuPont, 2007) and showed no indication of metabolism.

4.1.1.4 Excretion

Studies in rats and mice orally exposed to a single dose of FRD-902 (doses ranging from 3 – 30 mg/kg/bw) showed that the main excretion route for HFPO-DA is the urine (Fasano, 2011b, Fasano, 2011a). By 12 hours, 97% and 95% of the dose was retrieved in the urine of male and female rats respectively, which increased to values of 103% and 100% at the end of the study (168 hours post-dose). Negligible levels of HFPO-DA were found in the faeces (≤ 1%), which were likely contaminated with urine. Cage wash accounted for another 1% and 5% of the dose for males and females respectively. For mice, 31% (m) and 39% (f) was retrieved after the first 12 hours. By 168 hours, 90% and 92% of the administered dose was excreted in the urine. Negligible levels were retrieved in the faeces of male and female mice (2%). Another 10% and 6% were retrieved after cage wash.

4.1.1.5 Clearance time and half-lives

Clearance time

Two studies in rats (N = 3 per dose group) observed clearance rates following single oral exposure to FRD-902 and FRD-903 (Gannon, 2008b, Gannon, 2008c) receiving 0, 10 or 30 mg/kg/bw. Clearance time was described as the time required to remove 98.4% of HFPO-DA from the plasma. Results showed clearance times of 12h and 22 h for male rats, and of 4h and 8h for female rats following exposure to FRD-902 at 10 or 30 mg/kg/bw, respectively. Furthermore, the clearance time in rats exposed to either 10 or 30 mg/kg/bw FRD-903 were 28 h and 22 h in males and 8 h and 4 h in females. In mice administered with a single oral dose of 10 or 30 mg/kg/bw FRD-902, the plasma clearance time was 143 h and 57 h for male and female mice, and 139 h and 62 h for male and female mice respectively (Gannon, 2008a) (see also Table 13).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral exposure</th>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Male rat</th>
<th>Male mouse</th>
<th>Female rat</th>
<th>Female mouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 mg/kg/bw</td>
<td>FRD-902</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRD-903</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 mg/kg/bw</td>
<td>FRD-902</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRD-903</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One cross-species comparison study in cynomolgus monkeys and rats observed clearance times of HFPO-DA from the plasma following single intravenous dosing of FRD-902 (83% purity) (Gannon, 2009). Rats (3m/3f) received a single 10 mg/kg/bw or 50 mg/kg/bw intravenous bolus. Cynomolgus monkeys (3m/3f) received a 10 mg/kg/bw intravenous bolus. Blood was collected at multiple time points with a total study period of 7 days for rats and 21 days for primates. Clearance times were 22 h and 17 h in male rats and 3 h and 4 h in female rats following from single exposure of 10 or 50 mg/kg bw FRD-902 respectively. Clearance times were 11 h in male primates and 10 h in female primates following from single exposure of 10 mg/kg bw FRD-902 (Table 14).
**Table 14:** Clearance time (hours) of HFPO-DA in primates and rats from the plasma following a single intravenous bolus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemical</th>
<th>Male primate</th>
<th>Male rat</th>
<th>Female primate</th>
<th>Female rat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 mg/kg bw</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRD-902</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Half-lives**

Gannon et al. (2016) described the absorption, distribution, metabolism and excretion (ADME) and kinetics of FRD-902 in rats, mice and cynomolgus monkeys. This publication was largely based on the studies presented in the section on clearance times.

**Table 15:** Pharmacokinetic parameters of FRD-902 as presented in Gannon et al. (2016).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absorption Rate constant (kₐ)</td>
<td>1/h</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha phase Elimination rate constant</td>
<td>1/h</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half-life</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta phase Rate half-life</td>
<td>1/h</td>
<td>7.8E-03</td>
<td>3.1E-02</td>
<td>2.8E-03</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>1.0E-02</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>1.9E-02</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume of distribution</td>
<td>L/kg</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central compartment</td>
<td>L/kg</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>2.462</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13:** A (left) and B (right). Figure 13A illustrates a general, schematic overview of a two-compartment model containing a central (blood) and a peripheral compartment (all other body tissues) with first-order absorption and elimination. The arrows represent first-order fractional rate constants for absorption (kₐ),
distribution \( (k_{12}) \), redistribution \( (k_{21}) \) and elimination \( (k_e) \). Figure 13B illustrates the alpha (distribution) and the beta (elimination) phases.

The study authors used a one-compartment and a two-compartment model to describe the plasma concentration data for rats, mice, and monkeys and concluded that the two-compartment model gave a better description of the plasma concentrations compared to a one-compartment model (no further details are provided). From the optimisations followed the pharmacokinetic parameters as presented in Table 15 (absorption rate constant, alpha elimination rate constant, beta elimination rate constant, and volume of distribution).

Additionally, alpha and beta half-lives were determined for rats (m/f) dosed orally or intravenously, mice (m/f) dosed orally, and monkeys (m/f) dosed intravenously (Table 15). In principle, the alpha phase illustrates the (rapid) distribution of the substance between the blood plasma and other body compartments (e.g. highly perfused tissues) together with elimination from the body, and the beta phase illustrates the elimination from the body together with redistribution from the body tissues back to the blood (see Figure 13 A and B). Hence, the beta phase reveals the terminal half-life.

For risk assessment, the half-lives for orally administered rats and mice are considered most appropriate, as these are consistent with the route of administration used in the toxicity studies. However Gannon et al. (2016) note that the data were fitted best by a two-compartment model, this may hold true for the intravenous data, but it is doubtful whether a two-compartment model is suitable to fit the oral mouse measurements, which show a more gradual decline in serum concentrations in comparison to the oral rat measurements (as illustrated by a higher alpha phase in the mouse compared to the rat). Hence, this raises the question whether a distinction should be made between alpha and beta phases for this dataset or whether one-phase elimination would be more realistic.

In addition to this, both the intravenously dosed rat (female) measurements, intravenously doses monkey measurements, and the orally dosed rat measurements are very close (or even below in the case of female monkeys data) to the limit of detection from 48-96 hours onwards\(^{12}\). This raises concern whether these data are suitable to determine the beta phase of HFPO-DA. Overall may however be concluded from the data presented in Table 15 that the terminal half-life of HFPO-DA (as revealed by the beta phase) in mice, rats, and monkeys ranges from one to several days.

Last, Gannon et al. (2016) used the parameters in Table 15 to model repeated dosing (7 consecutive oral doses of 10 mg/kg/bw) for rats, mice, and monkeys. In this model, plasma steady state is reached after one dose in monkeys and rats. For mice, it required approximately four doses to reach steady state. However, due to the uncertainties presented above, and the results from repeated dose studies as presented below, caution should be exercised when interpreting these values.

**Plasma concentrations in mice upon repeated exposure**

In an oral mouse 90-day study (MacKenzie, 2010) according to OECD TG 408, groups of 10 CrI:CD-1(ICR) mice per dose and sex were exposed to FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water) at dose levels of 0.1, 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day. Additional animals (N = 5) were exposed for evaluation of the plasma concentration of the substance at 2 hours after exposure on day 0, 28 and 95.

The test substance concentration in blood was almost similar on days 0, 28, and 95 in female mice, indicating that steady-state concentrations were almost achieved on the first day of dosing. The test substance concentration in blood from male mice was lower on day 0 than on day 28, indicating steady state may not have been achieved before day 28. Compared to female mice, for male mice it took longer to achieve steady state concentrations in blood. The plasma concentration was linear with dose, implying that absorption was not saturated over the range of doses tested in this study (Table 16).

\(^{12}\) 20 ng/mL for the oral dataset and 1 ng/mL for the intravenous dataset
Table 16: Plasma concentration in mice 2 hours, 28 days, and 90 days after exposure (gavage) to FRD-902 (MacKenzie, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Day 0</th>
<th>Day 28</th>
<th>Day 95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3806</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>7192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42580</td>
<td>5214</td>
<td>52240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3606</td>
<td>1308</td>
<td>4198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>35340</td>
<td>9262</td>
<td>46580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an oral 28-day study in mice (C57BL/6) (Rushing et al., 2017) the immunomodulatory potential of FRD-903 was examined in groups of 12 (6m/6f) animals at 0, 1, 10, or 100 mg/kg bw/day, as well as serum concentrations were measured after 1, 5, 14 and 28 days. Serum concentration data indicated a lack of steady state for male mice after receiving 1, 10 or 100 mg/kg bw/day for 28 days. This is illustrated by the fact that serum concentrations still changed between 5, 14, and 28 days respectively. Therefore, these findings are in line with the 90-day study in mice as presented above.

A lack of steady state in male mice after 28 days of consecutive dosing is relatively long compared to the modelled point of steady state in mice in Gannon et al. (2016) (4 days with four consecutive doses). It should be noted that it is difficult to draw a conclusion with regard to a lack of steady state based on few measurements over a long period of time. To do so, it is extremely important that blood withdrawal is performed at exactly the same point in time following oral administration of the substance. Hence, the fluctuations in serum concentrations as presented in (MacKenzie, 2010, Rushing et al., 2017) could also be a reflection of the fluctuations between the times of blood withdrawal within the same animal (which is supported by the very large standard deviations). To determine whether steady state is reached requires ideally an extensive number of measurements.

4.1.2 Human information (including bioaccumulation in humans)

Half-lives

The half-life of HFPO-DA in humans is not known. Experience with PFOA shows that caution should be exercised in using animal data to estimate the half-life of perfluorinated substances in humans. For PFOA and other PFASs (e.g. PFOS and PFHxS) for which human half-lives are reported (Wang et al., 2015, Pizzurro et al., 2019), values are much higher as would be expected based on allometric scaling. Overall, the data in Gannon et al. (2016) indicate that the half-lives for HFPO-DA in experimental animals vary between and one and several days. In the absence of human data for HFPO-DA, a solid conclusion on the half-life in humans cannot be drawn.

Mechanism of accumulation

Gomis et al. (2018) note that, in comparison to the classic lipophilic organic pollutants that primarily bind to fatty tissues, perfluoro carboxylic acids and perfluoro sulphonic acids primarily bind to proteins. Over 98% of the molecules are bound to serum proteins (mainly albumin) or bind to fatty acid-binding proteins in the liver. For the shorter chain perfluoro substances, the free fraction in the blood increases with increasing concentrations, suggesting saturation of the binding sites. In addition to protein binding, it is argued that the half-life of PFOA is longer in humans compared to other species since in humans there could be stronger PFOA reabsorption from ultrafiltrate in the kidney back into the blood by organic anion transporters (OATs) (Yang et al., 2010). Hence, two processes could contribute to the bioaccumulation of these substances, namely binding of the substance to proteins in the blood and the liver, and reabsorption of the free serum fraction via the ultrafiltrate in the kidney back into the blood.
A recent study showed that HFPO-DA binds to human liver fatty acid-binding protein (Sheng et al., 2018). There are no studies available investigating direct binding between HFPO-DA and albumin, and therefore it currently remains unknown whether HFPO-DA interacts with albumin directly or not. However, highest concentrations of HFPO-DA in rodents are found in the liver and the blood, providing an indication that HFPO-DA follows the same pattern of protein binding as other PFASs (Sheng et al., 2016, Chen and Guo, 2009). In addition to this, no data is available on OAT efficacy for HFPO-DA. It is therefore not known what effect HFPO-DA has on the functioning of the OATs and if resorption of HFPO-DA in the lumen of the kidney will occur in humans or not.

**Human biomonitoring data**

In the study by Pan et al. (2018), PFAS concentrations were determined in serum from 48 residents from the city Huantai, living close to a fluorochemical production plant. The residents had no occupational history in this plant suggesting that any observed serum concentration is of a different origin than occupational exposure. HFPO-DA was detected in 37.5% (18 residents). The median value was below the method detection limit (<0.14 ng/mL), the geometric mean was 0.13 ng/mL and the 95th percentile was 1.72 ng/mL. Following the same calculation as for HFPO-TA (a structural analogue of HFPO-DA), the estimated daily dose of HFPO-DA of these residents via fish consumption would be 0.43 ng/kg bw/d. The serum level (0.13 ng/mL) is considerably higher than the daily intake from fish consumption (0.43 ng/kg bw). The study did not specify other sources to the daily intake. It is unclear what other sources contribute to the daily intake of HFPO-DA for this specific group of people. Besides that, the distribution of HFPO-DA in the human body is unknown. This study does not provide any information on the kinetics of HFPO-DA, except that it is confirmed that HFPO-DA is absorbed by humans.

In 2017-2018, the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services (NCDHHS) conducted a study in human volunteers to investigate the exposure to PFAS substances among people living near a fluorochemical manufacturing facility in Bladen County, NC (NCDHHS, 2018). Single blood and urine samples were obtained from 30 individuals in August 2018, and screened for 17 PFASs, including HFPO-DA. HFPO-DA was not detected in the blood or urine from any of the 30 participants. The limit of detection (LOD) for HFPO-DA in blood and urine was 0.1 μg/L (0.1 ng/mL). All participants noted they used bottled water as their current drinking source. The average time relying on bottled water was approximately 9 months. As people, on average, stopped drinking water from private wells approximately nine months prior to sampling, the authors conclude that these data may indicate that HFPO-DA does not stay in the human body for a long period of time. It however remains unclear to what extent participants have been exposed to HFPO-DA, as individual exposure estimates are lacking. This information is essential to be able to draw any conclusions from the data presented in this study. This study therefore does not provide any information on the kinetics of HFPO-DA other than a first indication that the human half-life may not be in the order of years.

In 2017, the blood of 24 employees from a fluorochemical production plant in the Netherlands was analysed for HFPO-DA (Van den Berg, 2017). The levels found were higher than those observed in the general population of Huantai. HFPO-DA was detected in 70.8% (17 employees). The levels in these employees varied between <1 and 169 ng/mL, with a median value of 1.55 ng/mL. These data are skewed with the highest three values being 26.6, 51.2 and 169 ng/mL, which is much higher than the other values detected. This study does not provide any information on the kinetics of HFPO-DA, except that it is confirmed that HFPO-DA is absorbed by humans.

It is not possible to derive a half-life for HFPO-DA in humans from the data presented above within a reasonable margin of certainty. Experimental data in some mammalian species show relatively short half-lives(Gannon et al., 2016). For PFOA, the half-life in humans of 3.8 years (Olsen et al., 2007a) is much higher than would be expected based on data from rodents and monkeys, in which half-lives of 2-4 hours up to 17-19 days were determined (Lau et al., 2007, Butenhoff et al., 2004). Because of this discrepancy between humans and tested mammals for PFOA, an extrapolation of half-lives of HFPO-DA in mammalian test species to humans may not be straightforward either. The ongoing Substance Evaluation on FRD-902 aims to generate further insight in the bioaccumulation potential of FRD-902 (and thereby HFPO-DA) in humans. This
information will also provide more information on the extent to which bioaccumulation may occur in other air breathing animals.

### 4.1.3 Conclusion on toxicokinetics (and bioaccumulation in humans)

The available data indicate that FRD-902 is quickly absorbed in mammals after oral exposure, and distributes mainly to the plasma and liver. Male rats and mice showed overall higher HFPO-DA tissue and plasma concentrations compared to females upon exposure to equipotent dosages, which might be explained by more effective elimination in females compared to males. Data furthermore indicate that the substance distributes into the foetus, and that there is limited transfer of HFPO-DA via lactation. The substance is not metabolised, is eliminated almost completely within approximately 24 hours via urine in rats and monkeys, and it takes up to 7 days to be fully retrieved in the urine from mice.

The half-lives established in experimental animals vary between one and several days. Human biomonitoring data in workers and the general population illustrate detectable HFPO-DA concentrations in serum/plasma as high as 169 ng/mL in workers at a fluorochemical production site in The Netherlands. It is not possible to derive a half-life for HFPO-DA in humans from these data within reasonable certainty.

For PFASs (e.g. PFOA, PFOS, PFHxS) (Wang et al., 2015, Pizzurro et al., 2019), it may be concluded that the half-life in humans is considerably higher compared to the half-lives for experimental animals (including primates). These variations in biological half-lives between species are suggested to be mainly due to differences in renal clearance. The human half-life of HFPO-DA currently is unknown, and in absence of human data for HFPO-DA, a solid conclusion on the half-life of HFPO-DA cannot be drawn.

### 4.2 Acute toxicity

#### 4.2.1 Non-human information

##### 4.2.1.1 Acute toxicity: oral

Three studies in rats and one study in mice are available on acute toxicity by the oral exposure route. The studies were performed according to OECD TG 425. FRD-902 (86% purity) and FRD-903 (99% purity) were administered by oral gavage at doses of 175, 550, 1750, and 5000 mg/kg/bw in rats and FRD-902 (86% purity) was administered at 175, 550 and 1750 mg/kg/bw in mice. Animals were observed during 14 days and then necropsied.

Female Crl:CD(SD) rats in the highest dose group (N = 3, administered with 5000 mg/kg/bw FRD-902) died; one at the day of dosing, one the following day, and one 2 days after dosing. In these rats, lung discoloration, discoloration of the mandibular lymph nodes, and liver were found. Hair loss, high posture, stained fur/skin, wet fur, lethargy, clear ocular discharge, prostrate posture, partially closed eyes, and/or salivation were observed in all female rats. However, with the exception of hair loss, these clinical symptoms had reversed after day 2. No body weight loss was observed. The oral LD50 for female rats was 3129 mg/kg/bw (Carpenter, 2007f).

All male Crl:CD(SD) rats in the highest dose group (N = 3, administered with 5000 mg/kg/bw FRD-902) died and 1/4 male rats in the 1750 mg/kg/bw dose group died. The remaining rats showed lethargy, skin stain, expanded lungs, eye discoloration and stomach discoloration. One rat in the 175 mg/kg/bw dose group (N = 1 for this dose) also showed lethargy. Other clinical findings in the 550 and 1750 mg/kg/bw dose groups were wet fur and stained fur or skin, which reversed after 2 days post-dosing. No body weight loss was observed. The oral LD50 for male rats was 1750 mg/kg/bw, with 95% profile likelihood confidence interval 1239 – 4450 mg/kg/bw (Carpenter, 2007g).

In male Crl:CD(SD) rats administered with FRD-903, 1/4 male rats in the 550 mg/kg/bw dose group, 2/6 male rats in the 1750 mg/kg/bw dose group, and 3/3 male rats in the 5000 mg/kg/bw dose group died. Gross findings included stomach discoloration, stomach thick, skin stain,
stomach distended with gas, and/or small testes and epididymides. The remaining rats showed lung noise, absent faeces, lethargy, not eating, stained fur/skin, wet fur, laboured breathing, lethargy, decreased muscle tone, prostrate posture, tremors, clear oral discharge, diarrhoea, ataxia, and/or high posture. No biologically relevant body weight losses occurred in surviving male rats. The oral LD50 was 1730 mg/kg/bw (Carpenter, 2008).

In female Cr:CD(SD) rats administered with FRD-903, 3/4 females in the 1750 mg/kg/bw dose group, and 1/1 females dosed at 5000 mg/kg/bw died. Gross findings included stomach discolouration, stomach thick, oesophagus fluid, skin wet, and/or mesenteric lymph node discolouration. The remaining rats, except a single rat dosed at 175 mg/kg/bw, showed wet fur, stained fur/skin, ataxia, laboured breathing, cold to touch, clear ocular or oral discharge, lethargy, lung noise, absent faeces, not eating, and/or rubbing face on bottom of cage. No body weight losses occurred in female rats. The oral LD50 was 1750 mg/kg/bw (Carpenter, 2008).

In mice dosed with FRD-902, all animals in the highest dose group (1750 mg/kg/bw) died. These mice exhibited lethargy and low posture. One mouse in the 550 mg/kg/bw dose group exhibited wet fur. No effects on body weight were observed. A number of gross lesions was observed, including discolouration of the lungs, cyst in ovaries of one mouse, and skin stain in two mice, but these lesions were considered nonspecific by the authors. The oral LD50 for mice was 1030 mg/kg/bw (Carpenter, 2007d).

4.2.1.2 Acute toxicity: inhalation

One study is available on acute inhalation toxicity for FRD-902, performed according to OECD TG 403 (Kegelman, 2009). Rats were nose-only exposed to aerosol concentrations of 13, 100, and 5200 mg/m³ for 4 hours. Animals were observed for 2 – 14 days after exposure and necropsy and microscopic evaluation of the respiratory tract tissues were performed, except in the highest dose group. No mortality was observed. Rats in the highest dose group (5200 mg/m³) showed red discharge around the eyes, nose and mouth, and red stained faces that lasted for 2 days. Rats in the 100 mg/m³ dose group also showed red nasal discharge immediately after exposure. No mortality, other clinical signs of toxicity or substance-related microscopic findings were observed in any dose group in this study (albeit microscopic analysis was not performed in the 5200 mg/m³ dose group). Body weight loss between 2.5% - 6.8% was observed in rats in the highest dose group as compared to controls. Rats in the other dose groups also showed minor decreases in body weight, however, a similar minor decrease in body weight was also observed in the control group. The LC50 for acute inhalation toxicity in male rats was reported as >5200 mg/m³.

4.2.1.3 Acute toxicity: dermal

Two acute toxicity studies for the dermal exposure route are available studying FRD-902; one in rabbits and one in rats.

Rabbits were exposed by occlusive patch for 24 hours to a dose of 5000 mg/kg/bw (no guideline cited). No mortality was observed (2 rabbits were used in the study). Moderate to mild erythema was observed that lasted for 10 days after exposure and then decreased. Epidermal scaling and sloughing was observed in both rabbits from 6 to 13 days after application and one rabbit showed a small area of necrosis outside the test area (attributed to test substance running out of the test site) between 2 – 6 days after exposure. An approximate lethal dose (ALD) of >5000 mg/kg/bw was reported (Filliben, 1996).

The study in rats was performed according to OECD TG 402 and included semi-occlusive application for 24 hours, followed by wash-off, post-exposure observation for 14 days and necropsy. The applied dose was 5000 mg/kg/bw (Carpenter, 2007b). No mortality was observed. Reversible local effects were observed on the treated skin. The dermal LD50 was >5000 mg/kg/bw.
4.2.1.4 Acute toxicity: other routes

No data available.

4.2.2 Human information

No data available.

4.2.3 Summary and discussion of acute toxicity

The oral LD50s for FRD-902 are 3129 mg/kg/bw, 1750 mg/kg/bw, and 1030 mg/kg/bw for female rats, male rats, and mice respectively. The LC50 for acute inhalation toxicity is >5200 mg/m³ in male rats. For acute dermal toxicity, an ALD of >5000 mg/kg/bw is established in rabbits, and a dermal LD50 of > 5000 mg/kg/bw in rats. The oral LD50s for FRD-903 are 1730 mg/kg/bw and 1750 mg/kg/bw for male and female rats respectively, no information for other exposure routes is available for this substance.

These values indicate that FRD-902 and FRD-903 cause mortality in experimental animals upon acute exposure via the oral route. FRD-902 caused toxicity at lower doses via the oral route compared to the inhalatory or dermal route. FRD-902 causes mortality at lower doses in mice compared to rats upon acute exposure via the oral route, and also appears to be more toxic to male rats than to female rats. Furthermore, FRD-903 and FRD-902 show acute toxicity at equipotent dosages in female rats, whereas the FRD-902 oral LD50 for male rats was higher compared to the FRD-903 oral LD50 in male rats. These findings may be explained by toxicokinetic differences between exposure routes, species and sexes as has been illustrated in Section 4.1.

4.3 Irritation/Corrosivity

In an in vitro Corrositex assay according to OECD TG 435, FRD-903 was evaluated for skin corrosion potential (Carpenter, 2007e). 500 μL FRD-903 was applied to 4 membrane discs to study penetration through an artificial membrane barrier. The substance passed through all membranes, with a mean breakthrough time of 68 minutes. Based on these results, FRD-903 was determined to be corrosive and was assigned to corrosive subcategory 1C.

The available skin irritation study according to OECD TG 404 showed limited and reversible erythema (score 1 or 2) at 1 hour after removal of FRD-902 (86% purity) (Carpenter, 2007a). Additionally, the available eye irritation study according to OECD TG 405 showed irreversible effects in 1 young adult New Zealand White rabbit treated with FRD-902 (86% purity) including cornea opacity, iritis and conjunctival chemosis and discharge (Carpenter, 2007c). The rabbit was euthanised the day after treatment for humane reasons.

4.3.1 Summary and discussion of irritation/corrosivity

Based on the available data, FRD-902 causes serious eye damage. Furthermore, FRD-902 does not result in skin irritation. In the in vitro Corrositex assay, FRD-903 was graded as corrosive to the skin in corrosive subcategory 1C.

4.4 Sensitisation

4.4.1 Skin

4.4.1.1 Non-human information

In a local lymph node assay (LLNA) according to OECD TG 429 (Hoban, 2007), FRD-902 dissolved in dimethylformamide at 0, 5, 25, 50 and 100% induced no increase in the stimulation index above 3 (EC3). Therefore, this test was considered negative and does not warrant classification as skin sensitiser.
A second LLNA test was available in the registration dossier in which a crude industrial grade HFPO-DA was tested positive with an EC3 of 37%. However, the relation of the tested substance with the marketed substance was questioned (Hoban, 2006).

4.4.1.2 Human information

No data available.

4.4.2 Respiratory system

4.4.2.1 Non-human information

No data available.

4.4.2.2 Human information

No data available.

4.4.3 Summary and discussion of sensitisation

Based on the first test the assumption is that FRD-902 does not induce skin sensitisation.

4.5 Repeated dose toxicity

4.5.1 Non-human information

4.5.1.1 Repeated dose toxicity: oral

7-day toxicity studies

In a screening study not according to OECD and GLP, 5 Crl:CD(SD) rats per dose and sex were exposed by gavage (water) to FRD-902 (86.6% purity) for 7 days to 0, 30, 300 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day (Nabb, 2008b).

Body weight was significantly decreased at the highest dose level in male rats (-8%). Statistically significant decreases in red cell mass parameters (red blood cell, haemoglobin, and haematocrit) were observed in male rats at 300 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day and in females at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Statistically significant increases in red cell distribution width, reticulocytes and neutrophils were also present in 1000 mg/kg bw/day females. Decreases in serum lipids (triglycerides and/or cholesterol) and globulin were present in all dosed male groups and in females at 300 and/or 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Other changes in clinical chemistry parameters occurred at 300 and/or 1000 mg/kg bw/day and included increased alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST), urea nitrogen (BUN), and glucose; and decreased sorbitol dehydrogenase (SDH), creatinine, and calcium (Table 17).

Table 17: Selected haematology and clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control in rats after 7 days exposure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haematological effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red blood cells</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoglobin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematocrit</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBC distribution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reticulocytes</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrophils</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serum clinical chemistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Selected haematology and clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control in rats after 7 days exposure.
Increased liver weight parameters were present in males at all dose levels and in females in the 1000 mg/kg bw/day dose group, up to 45%-63% increase relative to brain weight in males exposed at 300 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day. These liver weight changes were correlative to microscopic hepatocellular hypertrophy. Other organ weight changes included decreases in heart weight parameters (1000 mg/kg bw/day males; around -12% absolute and relative weight) and increases in some kidney weight parameters (up to 17% increased kidney to brain weight in 1000 mg/kg bw/day females). There were no corresponding microscopic changes in these organs. Test substance-related microscopic changes were limited to hepatocellular hypertrophy in the liver. Minimal to mild peroxisomal beta-oxidation activity was present in the 30, 100, and 300 mg/kg bw/day male groups and in the 1000 mg/kg bw/day female group at the sacrifice on day 7. A statistically significant increase in peroxisomal beta-oxidation activity was present in male rats at all doses and in females administered with 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Microscopic and organ weight changes in the liver were associated with increases in beta-oxidation and/or increases in total cytochrome P-450 enzyme activity.

A statistically significant increase in peroxisomal beta-oxidation activity was present in the 30, 300, and 1000 mg/kg bw/day male groups and in the 1000 mg/kg bw/day female group at the 7-day sacrifice. A statistically significant increase in total microsomal cytochrome P-450 content was present in the 30 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day male groups and in the 1000 mg/kg bw/day female group at the sacrifice on day 7.

In a study not according to OECD, 5 Crl:CD(SD) rats per dose and sex were exposed by gavage (water) to FRD-903 (99% purity) for 7 days to 0, 30, 100, and 300 mg/kg bw/day (Nabb, 2008c). No deaths occurred, and no significant body weight effects were observed at any dose level. Statistically significant decreases in red cell mass parameters (haemoglobin and haematocrit) were observed in males dosed at 300 mg/kg bw/day and in females (red blood cell count) at 300 mg/kg bw/day. Furthermore, an increase in red cell distribution width was observed in females at this dose. Decreases in cholesterol were observed in males at all dose groups, triglyceride and globulin decreases at the mid- and top dose, and creatinine, total protein, and calcium were decreased in males at 300 mg/kg bw/day. Females illustrated significantly decreased bilirubin at 300 mg/kg bw/day (Table 18).

Gross pathological observations include increased relative (about 12% to body) kidney weight and increased absolute and relative (53-88% to body and brain) liver weight in males at all dose groups. Females illustrated increased absolute and relative (18-21% to body and brain) liver weight at 300 mg/kg bw/day, but this effect was more apparent in males than in females. Microscopic findings were limited to hepatocellular hypertrophy in all treated male and female dose groups. Lesions were graded as mild in all male groups and as minimal in all female groups.

A statistically significant increase in peroxisomal beta-oxidation activity was present in the 30, 100, and 300 mg/kg bw/day male groups and in the 300 mg/kg bw/day female group at the 7-day sacrifice. A statistically significant increase in total microsomal cytochrome P-450 content was present in the 30, 100 and 300 mg/kg bw/day male groups at the sacrifice on day 7.

| Table 18: Selected haematology and clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control in rats after 7 days exposure. | ![Table 18](https://example.com/table18.png) |
In a study to determine target organ toxicity in mice (Crl:CD1(ICR)), not performed according to OECD and GLP, male mice (N = 5) were exposed to FRD-902 (86.6% purity) by gavage (water) for seven consecutive days at either 0 or 30 mg/kg bw/day. Body (105%) and liver weight (217%) were increased. Histopathology showed an increase in moderate liver hypotrophy, minimal single cell necrosis and a moderate increase mitotic figures (Nabb, 2008a).

Also FRD-903 was studied in mice (Crl:CD1(ICR)) to determine target organ toxicity (Nabb, 2008d). Male mice (N = 5) were exposed to FRD-903 (99% purity) by gavage for seven consecutive days at either 0 or 30 mg/kg bw/day. Liver weights were increased (223%) compared to controls. Microscopic changes included minimal single cell necrosis of hepatocytes, moderate hepatocellular hypertrophy, and moderate increases in mitotic figures. Also minimal vacuolation of hepatocytes was present in 2/5 animals but this effect was of uncertain relevance according to the authors.

28-days toxicity study in rats

In the 28-day repeated dose toxicity study in rats performed according to OECD TG 407, groups of 10 Crl:CD(SD) rats per dose and sex were exposed to FRD-902 (purity 88%) by gavage (water) (Haas, 2008a). Males were exposed to 0, 0.3, 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day whereas females were exposed to 3, 30 and 300 mg/kg bw/day. Additional animals were used to determine the recovery within 4-weeks.

At 30 mg/kg bw/day, decreased RBC count, hemoglobin, and hematocrit were observed in males. These effects were also visible at 3 mg/kg bw/day (Table 19). The decreases in red cell mass parameters were ≤7.9% below the control mean, but increased with dose. Results returned to control values after a four-week recovery period. No haematological effects were observed in females.

Table 19: Selected haematology and clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control in rats measured at week 4 (primary necropsy).
Table 19: Incidences of selected histopathological findings in rats measured at week 4 (primary necropsy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver hypertrophy</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Single Cell Necrosis</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifocal-Mild</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifocal-Mild</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Necrosis Hepatocellular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal-Minimal</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal-Mild</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test substance-related changes of multifocal centrilobular hypertrophy were observed in the liver of 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day group males and the 300 mg/kg bw/day group females. 4/10 and 7/10 male rats illustrated this effect at 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day. For females, this effect was visible in 4/10 animals at 300 mg/kg bw/day. Single cell necrosis (multifocal) and hepatocellular necrosis was observed in 1/10 and 3/10 males at 30 mg/kg bw/day and hepatocellular necrosis was observed in 1/10 and 1/10 females at 30 and 300 mg/kg bw/day (Table 20). No statistical analysis was performed for these effects. Lastly, male and female rats illustrated β-oxidation activity at the middle and high doses.

The NOAEL for this study was set at 0.3 mg/kg bw/day, based on the changes in blood parameters, increases in albumin and A/G ratio, reduction in cholesterol and globulin, and incidences of liver hypertrophy observed in male rats at 3 mg/kg bw/day.

28-day toxicity study in mice

In the 28-day study with mice according to OECD TG 407, groups of 10 or 20 Crl:CD-1(ICR) mice per dose and sex were exposed to FRD-902 (88% purity) by gavage (water) at dose levels of 0, 0.1, 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day (Haas, 2008b). The reversibility of the effects in the high dose mice was determined after a 4-week recovery period.

Decreases in haemoglobin and haematocrit were observed at 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day in male
mice, accompanied by a decrease in RBC count at 30 mg/kg bw/day. The changes in red cell mass parameters were decreased >10% compared to controls (Table 21). Effects were reversible upon recovery. No effects were observed in female mice.

In addition, alterations in serum clinical chemistry were observed. In both sexes, A/G ratio was increased at 3 mg/kg bw/day and above. Albumin was increased in both sexes at 30 mg/kg bw/day, and globulin was decreased at 3 mg/kg bw/day and above for both sexes. Moreover, the serum liver enzymes (AST, ALT, ALP, and SDH) were increased at 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day in males, and at 30 mg/kg bw/day in females (ALP and SDH). These liver enzyme level changes were consistent with hepatocellular injury. BUN was also slightly increased in the 30 mg/kg bw/day group males at the end of exposure (Table 21). Effects were reversible upon recovery.

Test substance-related gross necropsy findings included enlarged liver in the 30 mg/kg bw/day group males at the primary necropsy. Both sexes illustrated increased relative liver weights at 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day (78% and 163%, and 32% and 103% respectively). Liver weights were mostly, but not completely, reversible in the 30 mg/kg bw/day males and females. Test substance-related changes of multifocal centrilobular hypertrophy were observed in the liver of 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day group males and the 300 mg/kg bw/day group females. Adrenal gland weights (absolute and relative to body and brain weights) were increased in the 3 and 30 mg/kg bw/day group males at the end of the exposure period.

**Table 21:** Selected haematology and clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control in mice measured at week 4 (primary necropsy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haematological effects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red blood cells</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoglobin</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>-5.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematocrit</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-5.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serum clinical chemistry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globulin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/G ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liver enzymes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01

Females illustrated increased absolute (11% and 20.6%) and relative (8.3% and 17.4%) kidney weights at the 0.1 and 30 mg/kg bw/day dosed groups. Minimal hypertrophy of the adrenal cortex was observed in 8/10 males at 30 mg/kg bw/day, whereas females illustrated mild or minimal adrenal cortex congestion at 30 mg/kg bw/day. Decreased uterus weights (absolute and relative to body weights; 39.1% and 40.5% respectively) were present in the 30 mg/kg bw/day group females at the end of the exposure period. There were no histopathological changes in the uterus that were correlative to the uterine weight changes.

**Table 22:** Incidences of selected histopathological findings in mice measured at week 4 (primary necropsy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liver hypertrophy</strong></td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Necrosis Single Cell</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifocal – minimal</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Necrosis</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was multifocal single cell liver necrosis (minimal) in the 3 (4/10) and 30 (10/10) mg/kg bw/day group males and 30 (4/10) mg/kg/day group females at the primary necropsy (Table 22). These effects were not present anymore following the 4-week recovery period, but single cell hepatocellular necrosis was observed at 30 mg/kg bw/day in 1/10 males and 2/10 females. Lastly, male mice illustrated β-oxidation activity at all doses, and females at the middle and high doses.

There was an increased number of animals in the diestrus stage of the oestrous cycle in the 30 mg/kg/day group females compared to control group females at the primary necropsy. However, ovarian morphology, including number and maturational stages of corpora lutea were similar between treated and control groups, suggesting normal oestrous cycling. The significance of the differences in oestrous stage distribution between the 30 mg/kg bw/day group females and control group females is uncertain. The number of animals in the diestrus stage of the oestrous cycle was equal in the control and 30 mg/kg bw/day group females at the recovery necropsy.

The NOAEL for this study was set at 0.1 mg/kg bw/day, based on a decrease in globulin and an increase in A/G ratio in both sexes, and reduced haemoglobin, haematocrit, an increase of markers for liver damage (AST, ALT, ALP, SDH) and liver cell necrosis (during primary necropsy) in male mice at 3 mg/kg bw/day.

Other 28-day studies in mice

In addition to the studies included in the REACH Registration Dossier, two 28-day mouse studies were published in 2017.

Rushing et al. (2017)

Rushing et al. (2017) studied the immune effects of FRD-903 in a subacute study in mice. Groups of 12 (6 m, 6 f) mice (C57BL/6) were given oral doses of 0, 1, 10 or 100 mg/kg bw/day via gavage for 28 days. Two replicates of this study were done, temporised 8 weeks apart. In one replicate of the study serum concentrations of FRD-903 were measured after 1, 5, 14 and 28 days. At day 24, all mice (both replicates) were immunised using SRBC (sheep red blood cells). SRBC-specific IgM antibody titres were determined in serum at test end (T-cell antibody response, TDAR). Furthermore, splenic lymphocyte subpopulations were analysed at test end. One day after the final gavage dose, the animals were killed and the weights of thymus, spleen and liver were determined. Livers were analysed for peroxisome proliferation (peroxisomal fatty acid oxidation, hepatic acyl CoA oxidase).

Observed effects at 100 mg/kg bw/day include suppression of TDAR (7.3%) and decreased relative spleen weight (11%) in females, but in males these effects were not observed. Furthermore, increased T lymphocyte numbers were noted in males (74% on average). B-lymphocyte numbers were unchanged in both sexes. Relative liver weights were increased at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day (both sexes) and liver peroxisome proliferation (measurement of hepatic acyl CoA oxidase) was found at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day (males) or at 100 mg/kg bw/day only (females).

The NOAEL was 10 mg/kg bw/day based on immune effects (suppression of the TDAR in females and increased T lymphocyte numbers in males) at 100 mg/kg bw/day. The authors of the study conclude that these observations are in line with parameters affected by PFOA, albeit FRD-902 appears to be less potent, and further studies are required to determine the full immunomodulatory profile of FRD-902 and possible synergism with other PFASs.

Wang et al. (2017)

Wang et al. (2017) carried out an oral 28-days study in mice focussed on the induction of liver effects by two test chemicals, i.e. FRD-903 and the tetramer [HFPO-TA]. A single dose level of 1 mg/kg bw/day was tested for both compounds in groups of 12 male ICR mice. Liver weights were increased in both groups, most markedly so in the tetramer group. Furthermore, ALP was
increased in both compounds. AST and ALT were increased in the tetramer group only. Moreover, there was an increase in low-density lipoprotein cholesterol and decreases in total and direct bilirubin. Liver histopathology showed damage in both groups (hepatocellular hypertrophy, lipid droplet accumulation, swollen hepatocytes, and nuclei, steatosis, karyolysis) with the tetramer showing additional adverse effects such as focal cell necrosis, infiltration of inflammatory cells and vacuolar degeneration. The severity of these effects was not indicated. A NOAEL/BMDL was not derived in this study.

90-days study in rats

In a 90-day repeated dose toxicity study according to OECD TG 408, groups of 10 Crl:CD(SD) rats per dose and sex were exposed to FRD-902 (purity 84%) by gavage (water) (Haas, 2009). Males were exposed to 0, 0.1, 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day whereas females were exposed to 0, 10, 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Additional animals were used to determine the recovery within 4-weeks. Three high-dosed females died before the end of the study, of which two deaths were treatment related.

Both males and females showed decreases in haemoglobin, haematocrit, and RBC count at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day (males) and 1000 mg/kg bw/day (females) respectively. These parameters were approximately 7%-13% lower in males and 18%-28% lower in females when compared to the respective control group (Table 23). In addition, reticulocytes and platelet count were increased in males at 100 mg/kg bw/day, and basophils were decreased in males at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day. At 1000 mg/kg bw/day, females illustrated increased mean corpuscular volume (MCV), mean corpuscular hemoglobin (MCH), platelet count, and reticulocytes, and decreased mean corpuscular hemoglobin concentration (MCHC) and basophils (Table 23). After the recovery period, RBC count, haemoglobin, haematocrit, and reticulocytes were still statistically significant different from control for males at 100 mg/kg and haemoglobin, haematocrit, MCV, and reticulocytes were still statistically significant from control for females in the 1000 mg/kg bw/day group.

Table 23: Selected haematology and clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control in rats measured at week 12 (primary necropsy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red blood cells</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7.0**</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>-11.0**</td>
<td>-28.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoglobin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-6.7**</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>-12.8**</td>
<td>-20.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematocrit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-7.1**</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>-12.0**</td>
<td>-18.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2.1</td>
<td>15.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reticulocytes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.7**</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>392.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.8*</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>29.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basophils</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-25.0</td>
<td>-25.0*</td>
<td>-33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-50.0**</td>
<td>-33.3*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serum clinical chemistry</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globulin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-11.5*</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
<td>-33.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/G ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.6**</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>58.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total protein</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-9.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bilirubin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-27.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-9.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-13.2</td>
<td>-19.8*</td>
<td>-30.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>-43.3</td>
<td>-68.8**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liver enzymes</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>-19.2</td>
<td>-25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>-23.8</td>
<td>-30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.5*</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>-20.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

In both sexes, changes in serum clinical chemistry were observed. Males showed increases in albumin and A/G ratio and decreases in globulin at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day. Females showed
increased A/G ratio and decreased globulin at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Furthermore, serum cholesterol was decreased in males and females at 100 mg/kg bw/day and 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day respectively. In males, BUN was increased at 100 mg/kg bw/day. ALP levels and serum phosphorus levels were increased in males and females at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day and 1000 mg/kg bw/day respectively. Total bilirubin was decreased in females at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day, and total protein and γ-glutamyl transferase (GGT) were decreased at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Last, a decrease in urine pH and a large increase in total urine volume were observed in females at 1000 mg/kg bw/day.

Absolute kidney weights were increased in the highest dose group for both sexes (11% (m) and 18% (f)). Relative kidney weights were increased at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day in males (12% and 16%) and in females at all dose groups (9%-23%). One female at the highest dose group illustrated tubular and papillary necrosis of the kidney, as did one of the preliminary died females in the same dose group. 1/10 males dosed at 10 mg/kg bw/day exhibited transitional hyperplasia and mild acute inflammation of the kidney. Absolute and relative kidney weights were still increased upon recovery in males dosed at 100 mg/kg bw/day.

Absolute liver weights were increased in males at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day for males (23% and 59%) and at 1000 mg/kg bw/day for females (77%). Similarly, also relative liver weights were increased for these dose groups. In the 100 mg/kg/day group males, relative liver weight increase was mostly, but not completely reversible. In the 1000 mg/kg bw/day group females, liver weight changes showed partial recovery, but were not completely reversible following the 4-week recovery period. 3/10 and 10/10 males showed hepatocellular hypertrophy at 10 and 100 mg/kg bw/day, as well as 10/10 females dosed at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Hypertrophy was not associated with microscopic changes indicative of liver injury (such as degeneration or necrosis) or with changes in serum chemistry indicative of liver injury, nor was hypertrophy observed in animals at the recovery necropsy.

The NOAEL for this study was set at 0.1 mg/kg bw/day, based on and an increased relative kidney weight in both sexes at 10 mg/kg bw/day and changes in blood parameters, an increase in albumin and A/G ratio, a reduction in globulin and cholesterol, and an increased liver weight in male rats at 10 mg/kg bw/day.

90-days study in mice

In an oral mouse 90-day study (MacKenzie, 2010) according to OECD TG 408, groups of 10 Crl:CD(ICR) mice per dose and sex were exposed to FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water) at dose levels of 0, 0.1, 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day. Additional animals were exposed for evaluation of the plasma concentration of the substance at 2 hours after exposure on day 0, 28 and 95.

Table 24: Selected haematology and clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control in mice measured at week 12 (primary necropsy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red blood cells</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoglobin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematocrit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reticulocytes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum clinical chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globulin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/G ratio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total protein</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bilirubin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 (134)
Statistically significant increases in mean final body weight (test day 91) and overall body weight gain (test days 0-91) were observed in the male 5 mg/kg bw/day group, relative to control. Mean final body weight and overall body weight gain were 108% and 136% of control, respectively. The difference in body weight and body weight gain in the high dose males was attributed primarily to increased liver weight.

Increased platelet count was observed for males dosed at 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day. Furthermore, a small decrease in corpuscular haemoglobin concentration was observed in males at 5 mg/kg bw/day (Table 24). Also serum clinical chemistry changes were observed, however these changes were more evident in males compared to females. Cholesterol was decreased in male mice dosed with 5 mg/kg bw/day. Serum liver enzymes (AST, ALT, and ALP) were increased in males and females (ALT and ALP) at 5 mg/kg bw/day. Furthermore, SDH and albumin were increased in both sexes, and total serum protein was increased in males at 5 mg/kg bw/day. Moreover, there was an increase in total bile acid at the highest dose.

Changes in serum liver enzymes were consistent with hepatocellular damage and/or cholestasis. A test substance related increase in mean liver weight parameters was observed in mice exposed to ≥ 0.5 mg/kg bw/day (males) and 5 mg/kg bw/day (females). The increase in liver weight parameters in both sexes correlated with a treatment-related enlarged liver and microscopic hepatic changes. Additionally, mean relative (to brain) kidney weight was increased in males dosed at 5 mg/kg bw/day, but this was not associated with an increase in absolute or relative (% body weight) kidney weight. Other observations include lower mean weights of brain and epididymides relative to body weight, a higher mean weight of heart relative to brain weight in male mice given 5 mg/kg bw/day of test substance as compared to controls, and decreased mean spleen weight relative to brain weight at 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day dosed females respectively.

Histopathological findings in the liver include increased single-cell necrosis (10/10), minimal hypertrophy (10/10), Kupffer cell pigments (10/10), and mitotic figures (9/10) in male mice, and mild hypertrophy (10/10), minimal focal necrosis (3/10), and single-cell necrosis (1/10) in female mice at 5 mg/kg bw/day (Table 25).

Table 25: Incidences of selected histopathological findings in mice measured at week 12 (primary necropsy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal necrosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertrophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mild</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single cell necrosis; hepatocellular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimal</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitotic figures, increased</td>
<td>0/10</td>
<td>0/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 8/10 male mice minimal hypertrophy was observed at 0.5 mg/kg bw/day. Additionally, minimal bile duct hyperplasia was present in the liver of one male mouse in the 5 mg/kg/day group. Furthermore, minimal renal tubular epithelial hypertrophy was present in 5 mg/kg bw/day dosed males (9/10).

The NOAEL for this study was set at 0.5 mg/kg bw/day, based on the observed increases in liver weight and liver hypertrophy in both sexes accompanied by changes in liver serum enzymes, and single-cell necrosis in male mice at 5 mg/kg bw/day.
2-year study in rats

In the 2-year oral rat study according to OECD TG 453 (Caverly Rae et al., 2015, Craig, 2013)
Crl:CD(SD) rats, 80 per dose and sex, were exposed to FRD-902 (84% purity) by gavage (water)
at 0, 0.1, 1 and 50 mg/kg bw/day (males) or 0, 1, 50 and 500 mg/kg bw/day (females). Interim
necropsy was performed on 10 animals after 12 months. The remaining animals were necropsied
after 101 weeks (females) or 104 weeks (males).

One test substance-associated cause of death/morbidity was inflammation/necrosis of the
kidneys, which occurred in seven 500 mg/kg bw/day females and was characterised by papillary
necrosis. Females were terminated during Week 101, prior to scheduled termination, due to low
survival in all female dose groups, especially control and 50 mg/kg bw/day groups. However, this
did not impact the study as this was approximately 2 years of test article exposure. Even though
survival among all female groups was low there were no statistically significant differences and
survival was comparable among all groups.

Mean body weight in 50 mg/kg bw/day males was statistically significantly below control (-4% at
week 52) over most of the first year, and exposure to 500 mg/kg bw/day substance produced
adverse reductions in body weight and body weight gain in females (-13% reduction at week 52
and -20% mean body weight gain between week 1-52). During the 3 and 6 months time-interval,
RBC count, haemoglobin, and haematocrit were decreased in male rats, but not at 12 months
(Table 26). Females dosed at 500 mg/kg bw/day exhibited decreases in these parameters at 3, 6
and 12 months, as well as decreases in the RBC count for 50 mg/kg bw/day dosed females at 12
months. Additionally, MCV was increased and MCHC was decreased in females dosed at 500 mg/kg
bw/day at 12 months.

Table 26: Selected haematology parameters presented in percentage change compared to control,
measured in rats at 3, 6 and 12 months time-interval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red blood cells</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemoglobin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematocrit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCHC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reticulocytes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*P < 0.05; \**P < 0.01

At 12 months, serum albumin levels increased in males at 1 mg/kg bw/day (Table 27). Serum
globulin was increased in females at 50 mg/kg bw/day during the 6 months interval. The changes
in albumin and globulin in the mid- and high-dose male and female groups resulted in statistically
significant increases in A/G ratio in these groups at all intervals, apart from the 1 mg/kg bw/day
dose group at 6 months. Bilirubin levels were statistically significant reduced in females at the
mid- and high dose groups at almost all intervals. Furthermore, serum liver enzymes (ALP, ALT, and SDH) were increased in males at 50 mg/kg bw/day. Other observations included decreases in total protein and GGT for females in the high dose group, and increases in BUN for males and females in the high dose group. Also, phosphorus levels were increased for males and females in the high dose groups, as well as chloride, and potassium levels were increased in females in the high dose group.

In females receiving 500 mg/kg bw/day, minimal, statistically significant increases in urine volume and pH and decreases in urine specific gravity (suggestive of a minimal diuresis) were present at both the 6- and 12-month intervals. Although minimal, these changes may be correlative to increased incidences and severity of chronic progressive nephropathy observed microscopically in this dose group at the 1-year interim sacrifice. Females dosed at 500 mg/kg bw/day illustrated increased kidney weights and changes in the kidney, such as increased incidence of tubular dilation, oedema of the renal papilla, transitional cell hyperplasia, tubular and pelvic mineralisation, renal papillary necrosis, and chronic progressive nephropathy (Table 28). A test article-related macroscopic observation included “irregular surface” of the kidneys at interim sacrifice in one of the 500 mg/kg bw/day dosed females. At terminal sacrifice, this effect was noted in 16/70 females dosed at 500 mg/kg bw/day.

Table 27: Selected clinical chemistry parameters presented in percentage change compared to control, measured in rats at 3, 6 and 12 months time-interval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Month 0 0.1 1 50</td>
<td>0 1 50 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serum clinical chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td>3 0 3.1 1.7 10.6*</td>
<td>0 3.3 5.6 10.4**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 2.6 2.6 9.1*</td>
<td>0 3.3 -1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 6.7 8.3** 16.3*</td>
<td>0 -0.7 0.0 4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globulin</td>
<td>3 0 -3.4 -7.9 -9.0**</td>
<td>0 5.2 -1.9 -7.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 -0.5 -3.3 -6.0</td>
<td>0 0 -6.5** -17.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 1.1 -4.8 -8.2</td>
<td>0 -1.6 -3.3 -14.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/G ratio</td>
<td>3 0 7.6 10.9** 23.9*</td>
<td>0 -0.9 7.3** 20.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 8.4 9.5 17.9*</td>
<td>0 -5.2 8.7** 20.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 6.8 15.9** 28.4*</td>
<td>0 -89.3 3.6 23.2*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total protein</td>
<td>3 0 -0.3 -3.3 0.4</td>
<td>0 4.2 2.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 1.0 -0.4 1.4</td>
<td>0 -2.7 -2.3 -9.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 3.8 1.4 3.3</td>
<td>0 -1.2 -1.5 -4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total bilirubin</td>
<td>3 0 11.1 0.0 -22.2</td>
<td>0 -5.6 -27.8** -33.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 0.0 -27.8 -11.1</td>
<td>0 -10.5 -21.1 -47.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 16.7 0.0 8.3</td>
<td>0 -12.5 -31.3** -37.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td>3 0 2.5 3.8 16.4**</td>
<td>0 -4.5 -9.1 -5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 10.8 5.8 16.7**</td>
<td>0 -4.4 4.4 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 7.2 15.3 5.4</td>
<td>0 -2.5 3.4 35.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>3 0 19.2 9.6 5.3</td>
<td>0 -8.5 -21.8 -10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 16.9 7.8 -6.6</td>
<td>0 -17.9 -17.8 -23.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 0.2 -10.0 -20.2</td>
<td>0 -18.4 -17.5 -24.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGT</td>
<td>3 0 20.0 10.0 0.0</td>
<td>0 -14.3 -14.3 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 23.5 29.4 17.6</td>
<td>0 -23.3 -20.0 -40.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 -9.1 18.2 -9.1</td>
<td>0 -23.1 -15.4 -23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver enzymes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>3 0 -1.2 -12.2 -8.6</td>
<td>0 -0.6 -6.7 -13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 9.4 -2.1 18.5</td>
<td>0 -33.3 -38.4 -50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 -10.0 -12.2 93.9</td>
<td>0 -10.9 -1.0 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>3 0 -15.7 -14.3 -1.4</td>
<td>0 9.4 3.7 -2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 -3.8 -12.6 70.4</td>
<td>0 -35.3 -48.5 -65.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 -12.3 -5.8 228.2**</td>
<td>0 -9.6 -0.8 -3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>3 0 9.8 4.4 52.5*</td>
<td>0 -13.0 13.6 -2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 29.2 12.9 110.9*</td>
<td>0 0.3 10.1 -17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDH</td>
<td>3 0 15.3 12.7 35.1</td>
<td>0 42.1 73.8 44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 0 23.5 -7.9 11.4</td>
<td>0 -51.0 -64.1 -78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 0 8.6 17.9 140.8**</td>
<td>0 -7.6 5.4 -16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01
Table 28: Incidences of selected histopathological kidney findings for the chronic study in female rats at final sacrifice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>4/70</td>
<td>4/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/70</td>
<td>1/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>12/70</td>
<td>17/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>28/70*</td>
<td>42/70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant from control (P < 0.05)

In high-dosed animals of both sexes, increases in relative liver weight were observed at interim sacrifice. Three males in the highest dose group illustrated minimal focal cystic degeneration and five minimal to mild focal necrosis. For all females, centrilobular hypertrophy was observed at 500 mg/kg bw/day at the 12 month sacrifice. Additional microscopic changes at final sacrifice include increased centrilobular hepatocellular hypertrophy in 7/70 males and 65/70 females and increased centrilobular hepatocellular necrosis in 5/70 males and 7/70 females at 50 and 500 mg/kg bw/day respectively (Table 29). The latter effect was graded as severe mostly (3/5 animals) at the highest dose in males and mild to severe at the middle and high doses in females respectively. Furthermore, males showed a decrease in focal and periportal vacuolisation at 50 mg/kg bw/day. In females, a decrease in centrilobular vacuolisation, panlobular hepatocellular hypertrophy, individual cell hepatocellular necrosis, and angiectasis (i.e. blood- or lymph vessel dilation) were observed at 500 mg/kg bw/day.

Table 29: Incidences of selected histopathological liver findings for the chronic study in rats at final sacrifice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>24/70</td>
<td>0/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>24/70</td>
<td>0/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19/70</td>
<td>7/70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>42/70*</td>
<td>0/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>2/70</td>
<td>0/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/70</td>
<td>3/70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2/70</td>
<td>65/70*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>14/70*</td>
<td>3/70*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant from control (P < 0.05)

Reproduction/developmental toxicity screening study in mice

In a reproduction/developmental toxicity screening study (OECD TG 421) Crl:CD1(ICR) mice (N = 25) were exposure by oral gavage at dose levels of 0, 0.1, 0.5 and 5 mg FRD-902/kg bw/day (purity 84%) (Edwards, 2010a). The F0 males were dosed during study days 0 to 84 (70 days prior to pairing through 1 day prior to euthanasia), for a total of 84 to 85 doses. The females that delivered (with the exception of those females selected for toxicokinetic evaluation) were dosed from study day 56 through the day prior to euthanasia (14 days prior to pairing through lactation day 20) for a total of 53 to 64 doses. The females that were selected for toxicokinetic evaluation were dosed until the day of euthanasia (lactation day 21) for a total of 54 to 65 doses.
No effect on mortality was observed in the parental animals. In females dosed at 5 mg/kg bw/day, an increased kidney weight was noted. In males dosed at 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day, increased kidney tubular cell hypertrophy was observed. In both sexes increases in liver weight and liver hypertrophy were observed. Furthermore, incidences of single cell necrosis were observed in males and females in all dose groups, with 24/24 males and 21/24 females exhibiting single cell necrosis at 5 mg/kg bw/day. This effect was graded as minimal to moderate at the highest dose (m/f) and minimal at the middle dose (m). Females also illustrated increased incidences of focal/multifocal necrosis at the middle- (3/24) and high dose group (5/24) respectively. In the study report the latter effect was further defined as minimal focal coagulative necrosis. Hypertrophy and necrosis were observed in males and females at 0.5 mg/kg bw/day (Table 30).

In males, kidney weights increased with 8% at 5 mg/kg bw/day, which correlated with increased kidney tubular cell hypertrophy at doses 0.5 mg/kg bw/day (6/24) and 5 mg/kg bw/day (18/24) (Table 30). In females, absolute and relative kidney weights were increases with 21% and 10% at 5 mg/kg bw/day respectively.

The observed effects related to reproduction are noted in Section 4.8.

The NOAEL for systemic toxicity in parental animals was 0.1 mg/kg/day based on the incidences of single cell necrosis observed in the liver of males at 0.5 mg/kg/day.

**Developmental toxicity study in rats**

A study on developmental toxicity (developmental toxicity/teratogenicity) was conducted in rats, according to OECD TG 414 (Edwards, 2010b). Pregnant Crl:CD(SD) rats (N = 22) were exposed to FRD-902 (84% purity) at 0, 10, 100, or 1000 mg/kg bw/day by oral gavage during Gestation days 6-20. Dams were sacrificed on Gestation day 21. Organs including the ovaries and uterus, and foetuses were examined.

One female in the highest dose group died on GD 20, due to liver and kidney damage (moderate coagulative necrosis in the liver and fibrin thrombi in the glomerular capillaries). Test-substance related clinical findings (yellow material on various body surfaces, salivation), higher mean kidney weight, and reduction in maternal body weight gains were observed at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Decreased gravid uterine weights were found in the 100 and 1000 mg/kg/day groups. Furthermore, an increase in liver weight was reported in the animals dosed at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day, accompanied by focal necrosis in some animals at these dose groups (Table 31). Also liver hypertrophy occurred at 1000 mg/kg bw/day, and an oedematous pancreas was noted in two females (that delivered early) in this dose group at necropsy.

The observed effects related to development are noted in Section 4.8.2.
The NOAEL for maternal toxicity is considered to be 10 mg/kg bw/day, based on mortality, lower mean body weight gains and food consumption at 1000 mg/kg bw/day, and early deliveries, and microscopic findings in the liver (focal necrosis) at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day.

4.5.1.2 Repeated dose toxicity: inhalation
No data available.

4.5.1.3 Repeated dose toxicity: dermal
No data available.

4.5.1.4 Repeated dose toxicity: other routes
No data available.

4.5.2 Dose-response modelling

To provide an overview of the dose-responses and equipotent effect doses resulting from the available repeated-dose toxicity studies presented above, a dose-response analysis was performed using PROAST software version 66.16 and 66.24 (www.proast.nl).

4.5.2.1 Methods

Two 90-day studies (mouse and rat) and one chronic toxicity/carcinogenicity study (rat) were included for analysis (Haas, 2009, MacKenzie, 2010, Craig, 2013). Information from 90 days, interim sacrifice (365 days), as well as from the final sacrifice (707 days (f) and 728 days (m)) was included from the chronic toxicity/carcinogenicity study. In addition, also data from the males in a mouse reproduction/developmental screening study were included in the analysis (Edwards, 2010a), as these animals were exposed to HFPO-DA under a exposure regimen (84-85 days) comparable to the 90-day studies.

Information was assembled on absolute and relative (to body) organ weight (brain, heart, kidney, liver, spleen, testes, thymus, adrenal glands, epididymis, ovaries, uterus), serum clinical chemistry parameters (AST, ALT, SDH, ALP, GGT, bilirubin, bile acids, BUN, creatinine, cholesterol, triglyceride, glucose, total protein, albumin, globulin, and A/G ratio), haematology parameters (red blood cell count, haemoglobin, haematocrit, MCV, MCH, MCHC, platelet count, and absolute number of reticulocytes), liver histopathology data (hypertrophy, mitotic figures, increased pigment, mononuclear infiltration, focal necrosis, single cell necrosis, cystic focal degeneration, liver adenoma, liver carcinoma), kidney histopathology data (hypertrophy, tubular dilation, papilla oedema, transitional cell hyperplasia, tubular mineralization, papillary necrosis, chronic progressive nephropathy), and other lesions (pancreatic acinar adenoma and carcinoma, interstitial cell hyperplasia testes, interstitial cell adenoma testes) (Haas, 2009, MacKenzie, 2010, Craig, 2013, Edwards, 2010a).

Firstly, a dose-response function was fitted to the available toxicity data. In concordance with EFSA guidelines (EFSA, 2017), (continuous) organ weight data, serum chemistry parameter data, and haematology parameter data were analysed using an exponential and Hill model. For the (quantal) histopathology data, a suit of eight models (two stage, log-logistic, Weibull, log-probit, gamma, logistic, exponential LVM and Hill LVM) was used. This resulted in dose-response curves for each end-point and exposure duration (90/365/707 & 728 days). For each end-point and duration combination the data were tested using covariates, on possible differences in dose-responses between species (rat/mouse), sex (male/female), and study, when various studies with data on the same end-point, duration, species and sex were available.

Secondly, the fitted dose-response curves were used to calculate effect doses (ED) corresponding to pre-defined effect sizes and their confidence intervals (90% upper and lower bounds). As an
effect size, 5% and 10% increase or decrease in organ weight was calculated. For liver histopathology, 10% extra risk was chosen as effect size. Values for serum clinical chemistry and haematology parameters were, as far as available, based on biologically relevant effect sizes mentioned in literature (WHO, 2015, Muller et al., 2006). These effect doses are provided as lower and upper bound limits (EDL; EDU), reflecting the dose range in which the effect occurs, taking into account model uncertainty and the uncertainty in the underlying experimental data.

Calculated effect doses have as advantage that they are equipotent, and serve as a good starting point to compare between species, sexes, and study durations. Furthermore, they are not limited to the applied doses in the experiments, and therefore provide useful information when, e.g. large dose intervals are used and effect of interest falls between or just outside the applied doses. The effect doses of continuous endpoints are derived as a range from the lowest EDL from the exponential model and the Hill model, to the highest EDU of both models. The effect dose range (EDL to EDU) of quantal endpoints is derived by model averaging the results of the eight quantal models (see EFSA 2017 for details). Some of the upper dose limits reached infinity, indicating that the effect dose could possibly lie (far) outside the experimental dose range.

4.5.2.2 Results

An overview of all effect dose ranges (EDL and EDU) is provided in Annex III of this report. The effect sizes that are considered most relevant for hazard assessment are discussed below.

4.5.2.2.1 Liver

Subchronic exposure in mice

Relevant liver effects observed in male mice include 50% increase in AST (0.298-7.03 mg/kg bw/day) and 10% increase in albumin (0.376-5.41 mg/kg bw/day). In both males and females, 50% increase in ALT (0.512-3.62 mg/kg bw/day and 3.77-12.3 mg/kg bw/day respectively), 50% increase in ALP (Figure 15; 0.286-1.15 mg/kg bw/day and 1.35-2.96 mg/kg bw/day respectively), 50% increase in SDH (1.58-3.47 mg/kg bw/day and 4.47-7.91 mg/kg bw/day respectively), 10% increase in absolute liver weight (0.0945-0.322 mg/kg bw/day and 0.211-0.74 mg/kg bw/day respectively), and 10% increase in relative liver weight (Figure 14; 0.0856-0.224 mg/kg bw/day and 0.177-0.525 mg/kg bw/day respectively) were noted. Relevant histopathological findings include 10% extra risk on minimal liver hypertrophy (0.389-0.438 mg/kg bw/day and 0.995-1.72 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), 10% extra risk on minimal focal necrosis (1.13-4.51 mg/kg bw/day and 0.475-9.21 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), and 10% extra risk on single cell necrosis (1.55-1.79 mg/kg bw/day) in males. Other effect dose ranges may be observed in Figure 16, with corresponding values in Annex III.

In MacKenzie (2010), the LOAEL for most liver effects was 5 mg/kg bw/day, with effects being most apparent in males (with the exemption of focal necrosis in females (2/10 and 3/10 at 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day)). For instance, in males the LOAEL for single cell necrosis and statistically significant increases in liver enzymes was 5 mg/kg bw/day. At 0.5 mg/kg bw/day (middle dose) some histopathology was observed, but single cell necrosis was observed in 0/10 animals. In Edwards (2010a), the LOAEL for liver histopathology in male mice was 0.5 mg/kg bw/day, based on an increase in single cell necrosis in 5/24 animals. In this study no clinical serum parameters were analysed and hence no accompanying increases in liver enzymes are available. By means of dose response modelling, a better overall image is provided of the effects occurring in male mice, showing that histopathological effects and increases in liver enzymes occur with EDLs in the range 0.3-1.6 mg/kg bw/day.

Subchronic exposure in rats

Relevant liver effects observed in male rats include 50% increase in ALT (109-1350 mg/kg bw/day), and 50% increase in ALP (41.2-73.1 mg/kg bw/day). In males and females, 10% increase in absolute liver weight (5.94-16.9 mg/kg bw/day and 36.8-106 mg/kg bw/day respectively) and 10% increase in relative liver weight (Figure 14; 3.9-9.63 mg/kg bw/day and 27.8-66.9 mg/kg bw/day respectively) was noted. Relevant histopathological findings include 10%
extra risk for minimal hypertrophy (8.41-10.5 mg/kg bw/day and 172-347 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively). Other effect dose ranges may be observed in Figure 16, with corresponding values in Annex III.

In Haas (2009), the LOAEL for most of the observed liver effects in females was 1000 mg/kg bw/day (the highest dose tested), whereas at 100 mg/kg bw/day almost no statistically significant increased effects were observed. For males, the LOAEL was 10 mg/kg bw/day for ALP and increased liver weight, but other liver enzymes were not statistically significant from control up to the high dose (100 mg/kg bw/day), apart from ALP which was increased at 10 mg/kg bw/day. In Craig (2013), liver enzymes were not significantly changed from control up to the highest dose tested (50 mg/kg bw/day (m) – 500 mg/kg bw/day (f)). Dose response modelling illustrates that also the EDL of 50% increase in ALT lies around 100 mg/kg bw/day, and that various toxicologically relevant effects on liver end-points, e.g. 50% increase in ALP, 10% increase in liver weight and 10% extra risk in minimal hypertrophy, occur well below 100 mg/kg bw/day.

Relevant effects observed in male rats at interim sacrifice include 50% increase in SDH (1.26-51.5 mg/kg bw/day), 50% increase in ALT (3.01-41.3 mg/kg bw/day), 50% increase in AST (17.7-44.9 mg/kg bw/day), 10% increase in albumin (3.84-44.5 mg/kg bw/day), and 10% increase in relative liver weight (3.22-99.8 mg/kg bw/day). Additionally, relevant effects observed in both sexes at interim sacrifice include 50% increase in ALP (Figure 15; 0.645-8.35 mg/kg bw/day and 38.1-61000 mg/kg bw/day respectively) and 10% increase in bile acids (0.0152-210 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes).

At final sacrifice, 10% increase in absolute liver weight (0.244-37.4 mg/kg bw/day and 2.74-331 mg/kg bw/day respectively) and 10% increase in relative liver weight (0.956-31.8 mg/kg bw/day

---

**Figure 14**: Increasing trends in relative liver weight for male mice (red), female mice (black), male rats 90-days in Haas (2009) (blue), and female rats 90-days in Haas (2009) (green) exposed to FRD-902, fitted by a Hill model. Dotted horizontal lines indicate 10% increase in relative liver weight, whiskers indicate 95% confidence interval of the median response. Corresponding EDL and EDU are 0.0856-0.224 mg/kg bw/day (male mice), 0.177-0.525 mg/kg bw/day (female mice), 3.9-9.63 mg/kg bw/day (male rats), and 27.8-66.9 mg/kg bw/day (female rats).

**Figure 15**: Increasing trends in ALP for male mice (dark blue), female mice (green), male rats 90-days in Haas (2009) (red), female rats 90-days in Haas (2009) (black), male rats 90-days in Craig (2013) (pink), and female rats 90-days in Craig (2013) (light blue), fitted by an exponential model. Dotted horizontal lines correspond to 50% increase in ALP, whiskers indicate 95% confidence interval of the median response. Corresponding EDL and EDU are 0.286-1.15 mg/kg bw/day (male mice), 1.35-2.96 mg/kg bw/day (female mice), 41.2-73.1 mg/kg bw/day (male rats), and 478-1050 mg/kg bw/day (female rats).

**Chronic exposure in rats**

Relevant effects observed in male rats at interim sacrifice include 50% increase in SDH (1.26-51.5 mg/kg bw/day), 50% increase in ALT (3.01-41.3 mg/kg bw/day), 50% increase in AST (17.7-44.9 mg/kg bw/day), 10% increase in albumin (3.84-44.5 mg/kg bw/day), and 10% increase in relative liver weight (3.22-99.8 mg/kg bw/day). Additionally, relevant effects observed in both sexes at interim sacrifice include 50% increase in ALP (Figure 15; 0.645-8.35 mg/kg bw/day and 38.1-61000 mg/kg bw/day respectively) and 10% increase in bile acids (0.0152-210 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes).

At final sacrifice, 10% increase in absolute liver weight (0.244-37.4 mg/kg bw/day and 2.74-331 mg/kg bw/day respectively) and 10% increase in relative liver weight (0.956-31.8 mg/kg bw/day
and 16.9-345 mg/kg bw/day respectively) were noted in male and female rats. Furthermore, a 10% extra risk for cystic focal degeneration (0.674-37.3 mg/kg bw/day) was observed in male rats. An interesting observation is that for males, 10% extra risk for hepatocellular hypertrophy occurs at higher doses (45.2-76.4 mg/kg bw/day) compared to the increases in absolute and relative liver weight, cystic focal degeneration, and increases in liver enzymes. Other effect dose ranges may be observed in Figure 16, with corresponding values in Annex III.

In Craig (2013), the LOAEL for most of the observed liver effects in females was 500 mg/kg bw/day (the highest dose), whereas at 50 mg/kg bw/day (middle dose) almost no statistically significant increases were observed. The same holds for males, for which the LOAEL for most observed liver effects was 50 mg/kg bw/day (the highest dose), whereas there were almost no statistically significant effects at 1 mg/kg bw/day (middle dose). Dose response modelling illustrates that for males and females, the EDLs for relevant liver effects are substantially lower than 50 mg/kg bw/day.

4.5.2.2.2 Kidney

**Subchronic exposure in mice**

Relevant kidney effects include in a 10% increased risk of kidney tubular cell hypertrophy in males (1.59-3.19 mg/kg bw/day). Additionally, for male and female mice a 10% increase in absolute kidney weight (2.53-13.6 mg/kg bw/day and 1.33-17.3 mg/kg bw/day respectively) was observed. Other effect dose ranges may be observed in Figure 19, with corresponding values in Annex III.

In MacKenzie (2010), no statistically significant kidney effects were observed, apart from increased kidney to brain weights at 5 mg/kg bw/day. In Edwards (2010a), male mice exhibited tubular cell hypertrophy in 6/24 animals at a LOAEL of 0.5 mg/kg bw/day. Additionally, absolute
kidney weight was significantly increased at 5 mg/kg bw/day in females. Dose response modelling indicates that 10% increase in absolute kidney weight is observed with EDLs being 1.33 mg/kg bw/day and 2.53 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively. The EDL for kidney tubular cell hypertrophy is also within this range (1.59 mg/kg bw/day).

**Figure 17:** Increasing trend in BUN for male and female rats (covariates show no differences in dose-response between sexes) upon treatment with FRD-902 for one year (interim sacrifice), fitted by a Hill model. Dotted horizontal line indicates an increase of 10% BUN, with corresponding EDL and EDU of 58.5-413 mg/kg bw/day. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence interval of the median response.

**Figure 18:** Increasing trends in absolute kidney weight in male (red) and female (black) rats upon treatment with FRD-902 for two years (final sacrifice), fitted by an exponential model. Dotted horizontal lines indicate a 10% increase in absolute kidney weight. Corresponding EDL and EDU are 74.4-8100 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence interval of the median response.

### Subchronic exposure in rats

Relevant kidney effects for male and female rats include 10% increase in absolute kidney weight (40.3-287 mg/kg bw/day and 170-1060 mg/kg bw/day respectively) and 10% increase in relative kidney weight (16.7-121 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes). For males, a 10% increase in BUN was established (11.6-63.4 mg/kg bw/day). Other effect dose ranges may be observed in Figure 19, with corresponding values in Annex III.

In Haas (2009), the LOAEL for kidney effects was 0.1 mg/kg bw/day and 10 mg/kg bw/day for increased relative kidney weight in females and males respectively, 100 mg/kg bw/day for increased absolute kidney weight and increased BUN in males, and 1000 mg/kg bw/day for increased absolute kidney weight in females (no statistically significant increase in BUN observed). In Craig (2013), the LOAEL for increased BUN was 50 mg/kg bw/day in males, whereas in females this parameter was not significantly changed from control. Dose response modelling illustrates that EDLs for increases in BUN and absolute and relative kidney weights are in the range 11.6-40.3 mg/kg bw/day.

### Chronic exposure in rats

Relevant kidney effects in male and female rats include 10% increase in BUN at interim sacrifice (Figure 17; 58.5-413 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes), 10% increase in absolute kidney weight at final sacrifice (Figure 18; 74.4-8100 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes), and 10% increase in relative kidney weight at final sacrifice (8.97-49.2 mg/kg bw/day and 133-502 mg/kg bw/day for male and female rats, respectively). Note that the data from males (alone) do not indicate a significant trend, however, due to the lack of a dose group above 5 mg/kg bw/day it cannot be excluded that FRD-902 is equally potent in males and females, and thus has the same ED (range) in both sexes. Additionally, a 10% extra risk of progressive nephropathy (9.8-200 mg/kg bw/day) and a 10%
extra risk of tubular mineralisation (1.9-415 mg/kg bw/day) were determined for female rats at final sacrifice. Other effect dose ranges may be observed in Figure 19, with corresponding values in Annex III.

Figure 19: Overview of relevant effect dose ranges (EDL - EDU) for end-points related to kidney (left y-axis), expressed in mg/kg bw/day on a log (10) scale (x-axis). Male effect dose ranges are plotted in blue and female effect dose ranges are plotted in red. Effect dose ranges for which the EDU reached up to infinity, are provided as partly dotted lines.

In Craig (2013), the LOAEL for kidney effects was 500 mg/kg bw/day in female rats, whereas in males no kidney effects were observed. Based on dose-response modelling may however be concluded that the EDL for kidney effects in male and female rats ranges between 1.9 and 133 mg/kg bw/day.

4.5.2.2.3 Haematological system

Subchronic exposure in mice

In males, 10% decrease in red blood cell count (8.28-299 mg/kg bw/day), 10% increase in MCV (5.8-10.3 mg/kg bw/day), 10% increase in total reticulocytes (3.32-7.47 mg/kg bw/day), and 10% increase in platelets (0.085-19.9 mg/kg bw/day) were observed. Additionally, 10% increase in MCHC was observed for both sexes (6.9-258 mg/kg bw/day and 6.65-827 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively). Effect dose ranges may also be observed in Figure 22 and Annex III.

In MacKenzie (2010), LOAEL for an increase in platelets was 0.5 mg/kg bw/day, and LOAEL for decreased MCHC was 5 mg/kg bw/day. For females, these parameters were not significantly changes from control up to the highest dose tested (5 mg/kg bw/day). Other parameters (red blood cell count, haemoglobin, haematocrit, MCV, MCH, MCHC, reticulocytes) were not changed from control in both sexes up to the highest dose tested (5 mg/kg bw/day) for both sexes.
Subchronic exposure in rats

Females illustrated a 10% increase in MCH (938-1180 mg/kg bw/day) and 10% increase in MCV (818-968 mg/kg bw/day). Additionally, both sexes illustrated 10% decrease in red blood cell count (75.4-135 mg/kg bw/day and 171-433 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), 10% decrease in haemoglobin (54-103 mg/kg bw/day and 158-454 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), 10% decrease in haematocrit (56.5-132 mg/kg bw/day and 135-492 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), 10% increase in total reticulocytes (30.6-67.1 mg/kg bw/day and 139-476 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), and 10% increase in platelets (3.84-80.1 mg/kg bw/day and 28-719 mg/kg bw/day). Effect dose ranges may also be observed in Figure 22 and Annex III.

In Haas (2009), a LOAEL of 10 mg/kg bw/day was determined for red blood cell count, haemoglobin, and haematocrit changes, and a LOAEL of 100 mg/kg bw/day for increases in reticulocytes. Other parameters (MCH, MCV, and MCHC) showed no statistically significant effects up to the highest dose tested (100 mg/kg bw/day). For females, the LOAEL for changes in all parameters (red blood cell count, haemoglobin, haematocrit, MCV, MCH, MCHC, reticulocytes, platelets) was 1000 mg/kg bw/day. In Craig (2013), the LOAEL for males was 50 mg/kg bw/day for changes in red blood cell count, haemoglobin, and haematocrit. Other parameters (MCH, MCV, MCHC, platelets, total reticulocytes) were not significantly changed from control. In females, the LOAEL for red blood cell count and haematocrit were 500 mg/kg bw/day, whereas haemoglobin was significantly changed at 1 mg/kg bw/day (although not in a dose-dependent manner). Dose response modelling illustrates that the EDL for relevant effects overall occur in the dose range 50-200 mg/kg bw/day.

Chronic exposure in rats

At interim sacrifice, 10% decrease in red blood cell count (Figure 20; 106-317 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes), 10% increase in total reticulocytes (10.2-339 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes), 10% decrease in haemoglobin (Figure 21; 108-296 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes), 10% decrease in haematocrit (140-348 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes), 10% increase in MVC (331-584 mg/kg bw/day), and 10% increase in MCHC (579-1690 mg/kg bw/day) were determined for male and female rats. Effect dose ranges may also be observed in Figure 22 and Annex III.

Figure 20: Decreasing trends in red blood cell count for male (red) and female (black) rats exposed to FRD-902 for one year (interim sacrifice), fitted by a Hill model. Dotted horizontal lines indicate 10% confidence interval of the median response.

Figure 21: Decreasing trends in haemoglobin for male (red) and female (black) rats exposed to FRD-902 for one year (interim sacrifice), fitted by an exponential model. Dotted horizontal lines indicate 10% decrease in haemoglobin, with corresponding EDL and EDU of 108-296 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes. Whiskers indicate 95% confidence interval of the median response.
Figure 22: Overview of relevant effect dose ranges (EDL - EDU) for end-points related to the haematological system (left y-axis), expressed in mg/kg bw/day on a log (10) scale (x-axis). Male effect dose ranges are plotted in blue and female effect dose ranges are plotted in red. Effect dose ranges for which the EDU reached up to infinity, are provided as partly dotted lines.

In Craig (2013), females illustrated statistically significant changes in blood parameters at a LOAEL of 500 mg/kg bw/day (highest dose tested), apart from decreases in red blood cell count with a LOAEL of 50 mg/kg bw/day. For males, no significant increases were observed up to the highest dose tested (50 mg/kg bw/day). Dose response modelling illustrates that the EDL for relevant haematological effects lies within the dose interval 50-500 mg/kg bw/day. Due to the lack of a dose group above 5 mg/kg bw/day in males it cannot be excluded that FRD-902 is equally potent in males and females, and thus has the same ED (range) in both sexes.

4.5.2.2.4 Immune system

Subchronic exposure in mice

Relevant effects include 10% increase in albumin in males (0.376-5.41 mg/kg bw/day), 10% decrease in globulin in females (4.46-13.3 mg/kg bw/day), and 10% increase in A/G ratio in both sexes (0.713-7.26 mg/kg bw/day and 0.584-12.7 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively). Effect dose ranges may also be observed in Figure 25 and Annex III. In MacKenzie (2010), the LOAEL for increased albumin was 5 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes, no statistically significant increases were observed for globulin and A/G ratio.

Subchronic exposure in rats

Relevant effects include 10% increase in albumin in males (22.5-124 mg/kg bw/day), 10% decrease in globulin in both sexes (74-125 mg/kg bw/day and 419-631 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), and 10% increase in A/G ratio for both sexes (5.46-37.2 mg/kg bw/day and 41.8-238 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively). Effect dose ranges may also be observed in Figure 25 and Annex III. In Haas (2009), the LOAEL for changes in albumin, globulin, and A/G ratio was 10 mg/kg bw/day, whereas for females the LOAEL for globulin and A/G ratio
was 1000 mg/kg bw/day (no significant changes in albumin detected). In Craig (2013), the LOAEL for changes in albumin and globulin was 50 mg/kg bw/day in males and 500 mg/kg bw/day in females, whereas the LOAEL for A/G ratio was 1 mg/kg bw/day and 50 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively.

**Chronic exposure in rats**

Relevant effects at interim sacrifice include 10% increase in albumin (3.84-44.5 mg/kg bw/day). Furthermore, both males and females illustrated 10% decrease in globulin (36.7-442 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes, and 10% increase in A/G ratio (0.426-30.8 mg/kg bw/day and 7.03-271 mg/kg bw/day for male and female rats respectively) at interim sacrifice (Figure 23). Last, for male and female rats, 5% decrease in absolute spleen weight (0.115-16.8 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes) was observed at final sacrifice (Figure 24). Effect dose ranges may also be observed in Figure 25 and Annex III.

In Craig (2013), the LOAEL for decreased globulin and increased A/G ratio was 1 mg/kg bw/day for male rats (no significant increase in albumin observed up to the highest dose tested). For females, the LOAEL for increased albumin, decreased globulin, increased A/G ratio, and decreased absolute and relative (to brain) spleen weight was 500 mg/kg bw/day.

4.5.2.2.5 Other effects

**Chronic exposure in rats**

A 10% increase in testes hyperplasia in male rats (7.27-64.8 mg/kg bw/day) was observed at final sacrifice.
4.5.3 Human information

No data available.

4.5.4 Summary and discussion of repeated dose toxicity

Based on the available data, it may be concluded that the main target organs of FRD-902 in rodents include the liver, the kidney, the haematological system, and the immune system. The overall NOAEL resulting from the studies is 0.1 mg/kg bw/day, based on an increase in A/G ratio observed in male rats dosed 1 mg/kg bw/day for two years.

Mode of action

Several studies provide information indicating that HFPO-DA may induce the peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor alpha (PPARα) (Wang et al., 2017, Conley et al., 2019). This receptor is part of the nuclear hormone receptor superfamily, to which also the other PPARs (β, δ, γ) belong. These receptors mediate a wide range of biological activities, such as certain aspects of immune function (e.g. inflammation), lipid metabolism, vascular functions, glucose control, hormone biosynthesis, and embryonic and foetal development, and these receptors are consequently expressed in numerous tissues and cell types in the body, also during the development (Feige et al., 2006, Abbott, 2009). However PPARα induction as a relevant mechanism underlying human carcinogenicity in the liver or downstream events such as alteration of cell growth pathways, increased cell proliferation and decreases in apoptosis, is under debate (Felter et al., 2018, Guyton et al., 2009) (see also section 4.7 on the carcinogenicity of the substance), much less is known about possible interspecies differences of PPARα-related effects.
in other organs than the liver and during development (ECHA, 2011). Recently, Li et al. (2019) showed that HFPO-DA also may enhance human PPARγ-mediated transcription activity. Hall et al. (2012) discuss criteria to distinguish PPARα-mediated rodent specific liver effects as effects underlying the rodent-specific carcinogenicity from other adverse effects. Hall et al. (2012) note that liver weight increases, liver hypertrophy, steatotic macro-vascuolation without any other cellular damage, altered hepatic foci, and primary liver tumours are likely rodent specific phenomena, if induced by PPARα. However, when these changes are accompanied with histological evidence of structural degenerative or necrotic changes (such as necrosis, inflammation, and/or fibrosis), these effects (i.e. liver weight increases and hypertrophy) should be considered relevant to human health. The presence of liver necrosis indicates that another mechanism, such as cytotoxicity, could be in place.

Liver

The liver is the main target organ following from exposure to FRD-902 via the oral route. It is suggested that the observed effects in the liver could be explained by peroxisome proliferation. Stimulation of peroxisome proliferation via the PPARα receptor, especially occurring in the liver, is known to cause liver toxicity and neoplastic lesions in rodents, with unknown relevance for human health.

Mice and rats showed increased (relative) liver weight upon exposure to the substance varying from 0.5 to 1000 mg/kg bw/day under a subchronic exposure regimen. Also in a chronic study relative increases in liver weight were observed during interim sacrifice in males dosed at 50 mg/kg bw/day, but these changes were less severe than observed in the subchronic studies (15% compared to 163% in males dosed with 30 mg/kg bw/day for 28 days) (Craig, 2013, Caverly Rae et al., 2015). At terminal sacrifice, liver weights of the high-dosed males in the chronic study did not significantly increase from control. Conversely, in the high-dosed females in the chronic study, relative liver weights were significantly increased from control.

Clinical chemistry findings confirm the observed liver damage. Significant increases in serum liver enzymes were observed in mice and in rats. Changes in male mice include ALT (420%-1254%), AST (106%-478%), ALP (1134%-1221%) and SDH (1134-1221%) in the 28 and 90 day studies respectively (Haas, 2008b, MacKenzie, 2010). Increases in some of these parameters (ALT, ALP, SDH) were less elevated in female mice, and remained below 200%. Rats show overall smaller increases for these parameters in the subchronic studies. Notably, in the chronic study, the 50 mg/kg bw/day dosed males illustrated increases in ALT (228%), ALP (180%) and SDH (140%) at interim sacrifice (1 year) (Craig, 2013, Caverly Rae et al., 2015). Furthermore, a structural decrease in cholesterol serum concentrations was observed upon exposure to FRD-902 in all studies, as much as 30.9% in male and female rats exposed for 90 days at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day respectively (Haas, 2009).

Microscopical changes include increases in liver hypertrophy in rats and mice of both sexes in almost all the studies, as low as 3 mg/kg bw/day and 0.5 mg/kg bw/day in male rats and mice under subchronic exposure regimen respectively (Haas, 2008a, Edwards, 2010a). These effects were repeatedly accompanied by single-cell (multifocal) and/or hepatocellular necrosis at doses between 0.5-30 mg/kg bw/day for mice (Edwards, 2010a, Haas, 2008b) and 30-1000 mg/kg bw/day for rats (Haas, 2008a, Haas, 2009, Edwards, 2010b, Craig, 2013). The lowest observed treatment-related effects for the liver therefore include liver hypertrophy and single-cell necrosis in male mice in the reproduction/developmental screening study and the 28-day study at 0.5-3 mg/kg bw/day (Edwards, 2010a, Haas, 2008b). In addition, Wang et al. (2017) observed steatosis of the liver in mice dosed at 1 mg/kg bw/day for 28-days. The severity of this effect was not indicated.

By means of dose response modelling, an overview of equipotent effect doses is provided. In the subchronic mouse study, male mice show that histopathological effects and increases in liver enzymes occur with relevant effect doses starting from 0.3-1.6 mg/kg bw/day. In the subchronic rat study dose-response modelling illustrates that also the lower limit of the 50% effect dose in ALT lies around 100 mg/kg bw/day, and that various toxicologically relevant effects on liver end-
points, e.g. 50% increase in ALP, 10% increase in liver weight and 10% extra risk in minimal hyperthyropl, occur well below 100 mg/kg bw/day. In the chronic rat study, the LOAEL for most of the observed liver effects in females was 500 mg/kg bw/day (the highest dose), whereas at 50 mg/kg bw/day (middle dose) almost no statistically significant increases were observed. The same holds for males, for which the LOAEL for most observed liver effects was 50 mg/kg bw/day (the highest dose), whereas there were almost no statistically significant effects at 1 mg/kg bw/day (middle dose). Dose response modelling illustrates that for males and females, the EDLs for relevant liver effects are substantially lower than 50 mg/kg bw/day.

**Kidney**

Increased kidney weight was observed in mice and rats of both sexes treated with doses varying from 5 to 1000 mg/kg bw/day FRD-902 under a subchronic dosing regimen (Edwards, 2010a, Edwards, 2010b, Haas, 2008a, Haas, 2009). In the 28-day study in mice, kidney hypertrophy was observed in males at 30 mg/kg bw/day (Haas, 2008a). Furthermore, in male mice dosed for 85 days in the reproduction/developmental screening study, increased incidence of kidney tubular cell hypertrophy was observed at 0.5 mg/kg bw/day and 5 mg/kg bw/day. Microscopically observed kidney damage was present at 1000 and 500 mg/kg bw/day in female rats in the 90-day and 2-year study respectively. Additionally, in several rat studies, increases in BUN were observed in 30-100 mg/kg bw/day dosed males (Haas, 2008a, Haas, 2009, Craig, 2013).

Although kidney effects are observed upon exposure to FRD-902 (i.e. increased kidney weight, kidney hypertrophy, increases in BUN, microscopically observed kidney damage), these effects generally occur at higher dosages than the observed liver effects. Increased kidney weight was accompanied with increased BUN in several studies, but in the cases where kidney hypertrophy was observed, this was not accompanied by histopathological changes in the kidney, apart from the 500 mg/kg bw/day dosed females in the chronic study (Craig, 2013). Therefore, the biological relevance of the increases in BUN and the kidney hypertrophy without any microscopically observed kidney damage is unclear.

In the subchronic mouse study, dose response modelling indicates that 10% increased absolute kidney weight is observed with EDLs being 1.33 mg/kg bw/day and 2.53 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively. The EDL for kidney tubular cell hypertrophy is also within this range (1.59 mg/kg bw/day). Dose response modelling of the data from the subchronic rat studies illustrate that EDLs for increases in BUN and absolute and relative kidney weights are in the range 11.6-40.3 mg/kg bw/day. In Craig (2013), the chronic rat study, the LOAEL for kidney effects was 500 mg/kg bw/day in female rats, whereas in males no kidney effects were observed, apart from increases in BUN, for which the LOAEL was 50 mg/kg bw/day. Based on dose-response modelling may however be concluded that the EDL for kidney effects in male and female rats ranges between 1.9 and 133 mg/kg bw/day.

**Haematological system**

Changes in the haematological system include red cell mass reduction (4% - 28%), decreased haemoglobin (5% - 21%), and decreased haematocrit (5% - 18%) in mice and rats dosed with 3-1000 mg/kg bw/day FRD-902. Furthermore, increases in absolute reticulocytes (67% and 390%) were observed for male and female rats exposed to FRD-902 for 90 days at 100 mg/kg bw/day and 1000 mg/kg bw/day respectively (Haas, 2008a). Other observations include increased platelets in male rats (17%) and male mice (26%) exposed at 100 mg/kg bw/day and 0.5 mg/kg bw/day (Haas, 2009, MacKenzie, 2010), and decreases in basophils in male rats (25%) and female rats (33%) exposed to FRD-902 for 90 days at 10 mg/kg bw/day and 1000 mg/kg bw/day respectively (Haas, 2009). These effects suggest that exposure to FRD-902 may promote anaemia.

These changes were overall relatively mild, with parameters not exceeding 10% change from control up to dosages of 50 mg/kg bw/day in a chronic study in rats. However, data from female rats dosed at 1000 mg/kg bw/day under a subchronic exposure regimen illustrate that FRD-902 may promote severe anaemic conditions (Haas, 2009).
In the subchronic mouse study (MacKenzie, 2010), dose–response analysis of the male results showed 10% decrease in red blood cell count (8.28-299 mg/kg bw/day), 10% increase in MCV (5.8-10.3 mg/kg bw/day), 10% increase in total reticulocytes (3.32-7.47 mg/kg bw/day), and 10% increase in platelets (0.085-19.9 mg/kg bw/day). Additionally, 10% increase in MCHC was observed for both sexes (6.9-258 mg/kg bw/day and 6.65-827 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively). In the subchronic rat studies, dose response modelling illustrates that the EDL for relevant effects overall occur in the dose range 50-200 mg/kg bw/day. In the chronic rat study, females illustrated statistically significant changes in blood parameters at a LOAEL of 500 mg/kg bw/day (highest dose tested), apart from decreases in red blood cell count with a LOAEL of 50 mg/kg bw/day. For males, no significant increases were observed up to the highest dose tested (50 mg/kg bw/day). Dose response modelling illustrates that the EDL for relevant haematological effects lies within the dose interval 50-500 mg/kg bw/day. Due to the lack of a dose group above 5 mg/kg bw/day in males it cannot be excluded that FRD-902 is equally potent in males and females, and thus has the same ED (range) in both sexes.

Immune system

In many studies, increased albumin and/or decreased globulin, and associated increases in A/G ratio occurred in mice and rats of both sexes administered with 1-500 mg/kg bw/day FRD-902 for 12 months or less. Decreased globulin, increased albumin, and corresponding increases in A/G ratio may be considered indicators of reduced immune function (Gervois et al., 2004, Hachiya et al., 2018). Furthermore, Rushing et al. (2017) observed suppression of the T cell-dependent antibody response (TDAR) in females and increased T lymphocyte numbers (but no suppression of TDAR) in males exposed to the substance at a dose of 100 mg/kg bw/day for 28 days.

In addition to this, in the mouse 90-day study, female relative spleen weight was reduced at 0.5 and 5 mg/kg bw/day (21% and 18%), but this finding was reported not to be treatment-related (MacKenzie, 2010). Also in the chronic rat study, decreased absolute and relative (to brain) spleen weight was observed at interim sacrifice in females dosed with 500 mg/kg bw/day (-18%), although the study authors disregard this effect due to absence of macroscopic changes (Craig, 2013). However, a recently conducted study by Rushing et al. (2017) also reports relative decreased spleen weight (11.3%) at 100 mg/kg bw/day in female mice, and considers this a treatment related effect. Additionally, dose response modelling also illustrated a decrease in absolute spleen weight in male and female rats exposed to FRD-902 under a chronic exposure regimen (Craig, 2013).

Dose-response analysis of the subchronic mouse data shows that relevant effects include 10% increase in albumin in males (0.376-5.41 mg/kg bw/day), 10% decrease in globulin in females (4.46-13.3 mg/kg bw/day), and 10% increase in A/G ratio in both sexes (0.713-7.26 mg/kg bw/day and 0.584-12.7 mg/kg bw/day for males and females, respectively. Relevant effects from the subchronic rat studies include 10% increase in albumin in males (22.5-124 mg/kg bw/day), 10% decrease in globulin in both sexes (74-125 mg/kg bw/day and 419-631 mg/kg bw/day for males and females respectively), and 10% increase in A/G ratio for both sexes (5.46-37.2 mg/kg bw/day and 41.8-238 mg/kg bw/day for males and females, respectively).

In the chronic rat study effects at interim sacrifice include 10% increase in albumin (3.84-44.5 mg/kg bw/day). Furthermore, both males and females illustrated 10% decrease in globulin (36.7-442 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes, and 10% increase in A/G ratio (0.426-30.8 mg/kg bw/day and 7.03-271 mg/kg bw/day respectively) at interim sacrifice. Last, for male and female rats, 5% decrease in absolute spleen weight (0.115-16.8 mg/kg bw/day for both sexes) was observed at final sacrifice.
4.6 Mutagenicity

4.6.1 Non-human information

4.6.1.1 In vitro data

In two Ames tests with different species of prokaryotes according to OECD TG 471 (Donner, 2008, Myhre, 2008) dosed up to 5000 ug/plate using plate incorporation, FRD-902 was negative with and without metabolic activation. In a mammalian cell gene mutation assay according to OECD TG 476 (Clarke, 2008) in which the pH was adjusted to neutral, FRD-902 was negative with and without metabolic activation. In two in vitro mammalian chromosome aberration tests according to OECD TG 473, FRD-902 was negative after 4 and 20 hour exposure without metabolic activation but positive after 4 hour exposure with metabolic activation at the highest exposure level of 3471 ug/ml (Glover, 2008, Glatt, 2009).

4.6.1.2 In vivo data

In a mouse micronucleus test according to OECD TG 474 (Gudi and Krsmanovic, 2007) at dose levels up to 1300 mg FRD-902/kg bw by gavage, a reduction in PCE/EC was observed in the bone marrow, showing that the substance reached the bone marrow, but no increase in micronucleated PCE. Some mortality was observed at the highest dose. In a mouse chromosome aberration test according to OECD TG 475 (Gudi and Krsmanovic, 2007) at dose levels up to 1300 mg FRD-902/kg bw by gavage, a decrease in the mitotic index of bone marrow cells was observed but no increase in structural or numerical chromosome aberrations. Some mortality was observed at the highest dose. In a rat unscheduled DNA synthesis test according to OECD TG 486 at dose levels up to 2000 mg FRD-902/kg bw by gavage, no increase in net grains per nucleus was observed (Pant and Sly, 2007).

4.6.2 Human information

No data available.

4.6.3 Summary and discussion of mutagenicity

The available in vitro and in vivo genetic toxicity and mutagenicity studies show that FRD-902 is not mutagenic. EFSA (2009) concluded that FRD-902 is non-genotoxic based on the same dataset.

4.7 Carcinogenicity

4.7.1 Non-human information

4.7.1.1 Carcinogenicity: oral

In a combined chronic and carcinogenicity study performed according to OECD TG 453, 80 rats per dose and sex were exposed to FRD-902 (purity 84%) by gavage (water). The dose levels were males: 0, 0.1, 1, 50 mg/kg bw/day and females: 0, 1, 50, 500 mg/kg bw/day. Interim necropsy was performed on 10 animals after 12 months. The remaining animals were necropsied after 101 weeks (females) or 104 weeks (males) (Caverly Rae et al., 2015, Craig, 2013).

The study demonstrated statistically significant induction of adenomas/carcinomas in the pancreas in males at 50 mg/kg bw/day, statistically significant induction of hepatocellular adenomas and carcinomas in females at 500 mg/kg bw/day, and increased incidence of Leydig cell tumours in the testes at 50 mg/kg bw/day (Table 32). The incidence of Leydig cell tumours was not statistically significant, amongst others due to a relatively high incidence of these lesions in the controls. However, both the incidence of interstitial cell hyperplasia and interstitial cell adenomas was increased at 50 mg/kg bw/day and outside the historical control range, suggesting that
increased incidence of Leydig cell tumours was treatment-related. One interstitial cell adenoma was also present in one male in this group at the interim necropsy. The increase in uterus stromal polyps was within the range of the historical controls, and therefore it is uncertain whether this statistical significant increase in polyps is substance related.

Table 32: Tumour incidences and related histological changes in the OECD 453 study in rats (N = 70 per dose group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumour type</th>
<th>Dose (mg/kg bw/day)</th>
<th>Males HC (%)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>Females HC (%)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepatocellular adenoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatocellular carcinoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0-1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatic acinar cell hyperplasia</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-4.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatic acinar cell adenoma</td>
<td>0-5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatic acinar cell carcinoma</td>
<td>0-1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined acinar cell adenoma/carcinoma</td>
<td>0-8.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstitial cell adenoma testes</td>
<td>0-8.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uterine stromal polyps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0-13.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant (p = 0.05) in at least 2/3 statistical tests.
* Statistically significant (p = 0.05) in one statistical test.

The NOAEL for carcinogenicity is 1 mg/kg bw/day in males based on an increase in combined adenoma and carcinoma of the pancreas and 50 mg/kg bw/day in females based on an increase in liver tumours at 500 mg/kg bw/day.

4.7.1.2 Carcinogenicity: inhalation

No data available.

4.7.1.3 Carcinogenicity: dermal

No data available.

4.7.1.4 Carcinogenicity: other routes

No data available.

4.7.2 Human information

No data available.

4.7.3 Summary and discussion of carcinogenicity

The study demonstrated statistically significant induction of adenomas/carcinomas in the pancreas in males at 50 mg/kg bw/day, statistically significant induction of hepatocellular adenomas and

---

13 Historical control data from the laboratory performing the study. MPI, Research Neoplastic Historical Control Data, Male and Female Sprague-Dawley Rat – Charles River Laboratories, 2 Year Studies, Version 4.0, August 2001–August 2011 and June 2002- October 2010 CRAIG, L. 2013. H-28548: Combined Chronic Toxicity/Oncogenicity Study 2-Year Oral Gavage Study in Rats.
14 One animal from the 50 mg/kg bw/day group showed an interstitial cell adenoma at interim sacrifice. Additionally, incidences of interstitial cell hyperplasia were 1, 0, 0, 3 at 0, 0.1, 1, and 50 mg/kg bw/day at interim sacrifice (N = 10 per dose group). These changes were not statistically significant from control.
carcinomas in females at 500 mg/kg bw/day, and increased incidence of Leydig cell tumours in the testes at 50 mg/kg bw/day.

It was suggested by the study authors (Caverly Rae et al., 2015) that the observed increase in tumours was induced via the non-genotoxic PPARα mode of action, which is specific for rodents. Although the available data do indicate a non-genotoxic mechanism, it cannot be excluded that another mechanism may be responsible for the observed liver tumours. Furthermore, it is uncertain whether PPARα activation is responsible for the Leydig cell- and pancreatic acinar tumours, as the underlying mode of action for these tumour types remains unclear. Therefore the substance is considered to be potentially carcinogenic to humans.

PPARα is the most extensively studied signal pathway behind PFOA induced carcinogenicity, and it therefore is one of the primary suggested modes of action underlying the observed liver carcinogenicity in rats (US-EPA, 2016). However, studies report that PFOA may induce tumours via mechanisms other than PPARα in the liver, pancreas, and/or testes (Benninghoff et al., 2011, Benningerhoff et al., 2012, Buhrke et al., 2015, Rosen et al., 2017, Cheng and Klaassen, 2008, Rosen et al., 2008, Ren et al., 2009, Abe et al., 2017, Scharmach et al., 2012). A detailed discussion on the possible modes of action by which HFPO-DA may cause carcinogenicity, including the accompanying uncertainties, is described in the Substance Evaluation Decision published on ECHA’s website. 

PFOA and HFPO-DA show similar neoplastic changes upon exposure (Caverly Rae et al., 2015, Butenhoff et al., 2012, Biegel et al., 2001). In 2011, ECHA’s Risk Assessment Committee (RAC) concluded that, for APFO, the contribution to PFOA-induced liver tumours of molecular pathways other than PPARα cannot be fully excluded, the mode of action of pancreatic cell adenomas was unknown, and evidence was insufficient to link Leydig cell tumours to PPARα (ECHA, 2011). Consequently, APFO was classified as Carc. 2 under CLP Regulation (EC) No. 1272/2008. Also IARC concluded in 2016 that there was moderate evidence for the mechanisms underlying PFOA-induced carcinogenicity, among which some evidence with relevance to humans. Therefore, PFOA was evaluated by IARC as possibly carcinogenic to humans (IARC, 2016).

ECHA is aware that PPARα induction as a relevant mechanism underlying human carcinogenicity in the liver is under debate (Felter et al., 2018, Guyton et al., 2009). However, beyond the question on whether the biological responses observed in rodents related to the activation of PPARα are relevant to assess the carcinogenic potential in humans, contribution of other pathways to tumour development after exposure to HFPO-DA cannot be ruled out. Consequently, it is not certain whether PPARα is required for tumorigenesis in either rodents or humans. Based on the given, there is a concern that HFPO-DA is a human carcinogen as well. Data are currently insufficient to conclude on the substance its full carcinogenic potential. From the data presented in Section 4.5 can be concluded that overall, the registered substance shows a higher toxic potency in mice compared to rats. Consequently, there is a lack of data with regard to the carcinogenic potential of this substance in species other than the rat, and therefore the requested carcinogenicity study in mice is warranted. This is under investigation in an ongoing Substance Evaluation. Also the US-EPA stress the need for more information on the carcinogenicity of HFPO-DA in the form of chronic exposure in mice (US-EPA, 2018).

https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/8c824841-e218-34bc-0c3f-f47a7ce2e70e
Ammonium pentadecafluorooctanoate; EC number 223-320-4; CAS number 3825-26-1
4.8 Toxicity for reproduction

4.8.1 Effects on fertility

4.8.1.1 Non-human information

In a reproduction/developmental screening test according to OECD TG 421, Crl:CD1(ICR) mice (N = 25) were exposed by oral gavage at dose levels of 0, 0.1, 0.5 and 5 mg FRD-902/kg bw/day (purity 84%) (Edwards, 2010a). The F0 males were dosed during study days 0 to 84 (70 days prior to pairing through 1 day prior to euthanasia), for a total of 84 to 85 doses. The females that delivered (with the exception of those females selected for toxicokinetic evaluation) were dosed from study day 56 through the day prior to euthanasia (14 days prior to pairing through lactation day 20) for a total of 53 to 64 doses. The females that were selected for toxicokinetic evaluation were dosed through the day of euthanasia (lactation day 21) for a total of 54 to 65 doses.

No effect on mortality was observed for the parental animals. In both sexes increases in liver weight and liver hypertrophy were observed. Furthermore, incidences of single cell necrosis were observed in males and females in all dose groups, with 24/24 males and 21/24 females exhibiting single cell necrosis at 5 mg/kg bw/day. Females also illustrated increased incidences of focal/multifocal necrosis at the middle- (3/24) and high dose group (5/24) respectively. Additionally, in males, kidney weights increased 8% at 5 mg/kg bw/day, which correlated with increased kidney tubular cell hypertrophy at doses 0.5 mg/kg bw/day (6/24) and 5 mg/kg bw/day (18/24). In females, absolute and relative kidney weights were increases with 21% and 10% at 5 mg/kg bw/day.

No effect on reproductive performance was reported. Sex ratio, survival, and physical condition of the F1 pups was unaffected at all dose levels. However, at 5 mg/kg per day, male and female F1 pups exhibited significantly lower mean body weights compared to controls at PNDs 4, 7, 14, 21 and 28, with decreases reaching over 20% at weaning (i.e. PND 21). Male F1 pups continued to exhibit significantly lower mean body weights at PNDs 35 and 40 (~10%). The weight of the female F1 pups returned to control group mean body weight values at PNDs 35 and 40. Serum concentrations of parental animals and pups indicate limited transfer of FRD-902 via lactation.

Based on these results, the NOAEL for reproductive toxicity was 5 mg/kg bw/day, as no effects on reproduction were observed at any of the doses levels tested. The NOAEL for systemic toxicity in parental animals was 0.1 mg/kg bw/day based on the incidences of hepatic single cell necrosis observed in males at 0.5 mg/kg bw/day. The NOAEL for systemic toxicity in the offspring was 0.5 mg/kg bw/day based on body weight decrements in the F1 males and females in the 5 mg/kg bw/day group during the pre-weaning period.

However, the results from this study in mice do not allow for final conclusions regarding the reproductive effects because the highest dose level tested only exerted minimal effects in the parental animals. Therefore, information is regarded inconclusive with respect to potential effects on fertility and development.

4.8.1.2 Human information

No data available.

4.8.2 Developmental toxicity

4.8.2.1 Non-human information

A study on developmental toxicity (developmental toxicity/teratogenicity) was conducted in rats, according to OECD Guideline 414 (Edwards, 2010b). Pregnant rats were exposed to FRD-902 (84% purity) at 0, 10, 100, or 1000 mg/kg bw/day by oral gavage during Gestation days 6-20. Dams were sacrificed on Gestation day 21. Organs including the ovaries and uterus, and foetuses were examined.
One female in the highest dose group died on GD 20, due to liver and kidney damage. Four and 9 females in the 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day groups, respectively, delivered early on gestation day 21. The mortality in the 1000 mg/kg bw/day group and early deliveries in the 100 and 1000 mg/kg/day groups were considered test substance-related.

Test-substance related clinical findings (yellow material on various body surfaces, salivation), higher mean kidney weight, reduction in food consumption, and reduction in terminal maternal body weight were observed at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Decreased gravid uterine weights were found in the 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day groups (10% and 25% respectively). Mean corrected body weight and mean corrected body weight gain were not significantly decreased from control in any of the treated dose groups. Furthermore, an increase in liver weight was reported in the animals dosed at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day, accompanied by focal necrosis in some animals at these dose groups. Also liver hypertrophy occurred at 1000 mg/kg bw/day, and two females showed an oedematous pancreas in this dose group.

At 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day, mean foetal weight was reduced by 8.8% and 28.1% respectively. The decreased gravid uterine weight at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day was attributed to the substance-related decreases in mean foetal weight. No effects were found on foetal survival, on malformations or on variations, besides a higher incidence of 14th rudimentary ribs at 1000 mg/kg bw/day.

A second study was conducted to verify the apparent dose-related early deliveries in the dams on gestation day 21. This study used the same experimental design but was confined to a control group and a group dosed at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. The increase in early deliveries was confirmed this study, as three early deliveries were observed in an unknown number of dams versus none in the controls. Also the foetal weight was decreased. In addition, comparable maternal effects were observed as in the above study.

The NOAEL for maternal toxicity is considered to be 10 mg/kg bw/day, based on mortality, lower mean body weight, food consumption, and changes in the kidney and the pancreas at 1000 mg/kg bw/day, and microscopic findings in the liver (focal necrosis) at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day. The NOAEL for developmental toxicity is 10 mg/kg bw/day, based on early deliveries, decreased gravid uterine weight, and lower mean foetal weights at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day.

Conley et al. (2019)

A recent study conducted by the US-EPA (Conley et al., 2019), investigated whether FRD-902 affects androgen-dependent development or interferes with steroid receptor activity. Estrogen, androgen and glucocorticoid receptor activity were studied using an array of in vitro transactivation assays. Furthermore, Crl:CD(SD) rats (N = 3-9 dams for each) were orally exposed to HFPO-DA at either 0, 1, 3, 10, 30, 62.5, 125, 250, or 500 mg/kg bw/day during GD 14-18 to evaluate potential maternal, foetal, and postnatal effects. Dams were examined for weight gain, reproductive output, liver PPAR (α, β/δ, and γ) pathway gene expression, liver weight, serum lipids and thyroid hormones, and HFPO-DA serum concentrations. Foetuses were examined for testis testosterone production, testis gene expression, and HFPO-DA plasma concentrations. Additionally, in a pilot evaluation of postnatal development, dams (N = 3) were exposed to FRD-902 at either 0 or 125 mg/kg bw/day during GD 14-18. The F1 generation was followed during development, weighed and euthanised at PND 128 (females) or PND 146 (males), examined for reproductive tract malformations, and tissue weights were collected.

Dams illustrated decreased serum thyroid hormone concentrations at 30 mg/kg bw/day (total T3) or 125 mg/kg bw/day (total T4) and higher. Other observations in dams include decreased serum lipid concentrations at 125 mg/kg bw/day or higher, and increased liver weights at 62.5 mg/kg bw/day and above. There were no significant changes in the number of live pups, resorptions, or foetal body weights compared to control. Moreover, HFPO-DA did not result in in vitro estrogenic, androgenic, or glucocorticoid receptor activity, nor did it affect testosterone production in the foetal testis or change the expression of genes key for male development.
Regarding gene transcription profiles, both maternal and foetal livers showed upregulation of many genes associated with the PPAR signalling pathway from 1 mg/kg bw/day and higher. This illustrates that HFPO-DA is also bioavailable to the foetus and hence crosses the placenta. Remarkably, foetal livers were more sensitive in the number of genes affected and the degree of upregulation, suggesting higher sensitivity to HFPO-DA exposure during earlier life stages.

The pilot of postnatal development illustrated that at 125 mg/kg bw/day, exposure to HFPO-DA during GD 14-18 resulted in decreased female body weight and decreased weight of male reproductive tissues in F1 animals. More specifically, adult F1 males showed significantly lower weight of the right testis, left testis, paired testes, right epididymides, left epididymides, paired epididymides, and epididymal adipose tissue. These changes were only detected on individual and not on litter basis. F1 females illustrated decreased body weight at several timepoints during development (indicating a potential growth deficit), and adult F1 females illustrated decreases anogenital distance, and decreased liver weights on an individual basis.

The authors concluded that more research is needed, e.g. a study with an expanded dosing period which includes the entire period of foetal development, to further examine the mode of action underlying HFPO-DA toxicity and to study potential effects on foetal and neonatal development that are not covered by the exposure regimen of the pilot study.

4.8.2.2 Human information

No data available.

4.8.3 Summary and discussion of reproductive toxicity

In the available reproduction/developmental screening study in mice, FRD-902 did not cause any reproductive effects. The NOAEL for reproductive toxicity is set at 5 mg/kg bw/day, as no effects on reproduction were observed at any of the doses levels tested. In the parental animals, liver single-cell necrosis was observed in males at 0.5 mg/kg bw/day, in concordance with the effects observed in the subchronic and chronic toxicity studies. Furthermore, F1 animals of both sexes showed decreased mean body weight during the pre-weaning period and during the weaning period (m). However, the results from the reproduction/developmental screening study in mice do not allow for final conclusions regarding the reproductive effects because the highest dose level tested only exerted minimal effects in the parental animals. Therefore, information is regarded inconclusive with respect to potential effects on fertility and development.

In a postnatal developmental toxicity (PNDT) study in rats, substance-related developmental effects upon exposure to FRD-902 include early deliveries, decreased gravid uterine weight, and lower mean foetal body weight at 100 and 1000 mg/kg bw/day (Edwards, 2010b). No effects were found on foetal survival, on malformations, or on variations, besides a higher incidence of 14\textsuperscript{th} rudimentary ribs at 1000 mg/kg bw/day. Additionally, in a pilot postnatal study using one dose (125 mg/kg bw/day), F1 rat male decreased epididymides weight, and F1 rat female decreased anogenital distance and developmental body weight decrements were observed (Conley et al., 2019), the latter being in line with the observed decreases in body weight during the pre-weaning period (m/f) and weaning period (m) in mice (Edwards, 2010a, Conley et al., 2019).

Additionally, studies in Section 4.5 provide some indication that the reproductive organs may be affected upon treatment with HFPO-DA. The PNDT study in rats (Edwards, 2010b) as well as the 28-day study in mice (Haas, 2008b) show that FRD-902 caused decreased mean uterus weight, and furthermore resulted in an increased number of females that were in the diestrus stage of the oestrous cycle (Haas, 2008b). However, ovarian morphology was similar in these animals compared to controls. Also, male mice had decreased mean epididymides weight, but without any morphological changes observed (MacKenzie, 2010), in line with the decreased epididymis weight observed in Conley et al. (2019).
PFOA, PFNA, PFDA and their salts have been classified as either Toxic to Reproduction 1B or 2 by ECHA’s Risk Assessment Committee (RAC) (ECHA, 2011, ECHA, 2014, ECHA, 2015b). PFOA is classified as Repr. 1B for development based on positive results mainly in mice (full litter resorptions, reduced postnatal survival, and delays in growth and development) (ECHA, 2011). For FRD-902, the current database for developmental toxicity testing in mice is restricted to an OECD TG 421 study with insufficient dosing. Consequently, the potential of HFPO-DA to induce developmental toxicity is detected based on the findings in the rat, and may be underestimated by the lack of relevant mice data. Nevertheless, these preliminary data already provide some indication that HFPO-DA may cause developmental effects.

4.9 Other effects

4.9.1 Non-human information

4.9.1.1 Neurotoxicity

Richards et al. (2018) reports an abstract of an ex vivo neurotoxicity study for FRD-902 using rat brain capillaries. The effect on the blood brain barrier (BBB) was examined by measuring the effect at FRD-902 test concentrations of 1, 10, 100 1000 nM on 3 well-established efflux transporters (P-gp, BCRP, MRP2). A concentration-related decrease in P-gp and BCRP activity was found, an effect which may reduce the protective function of the BBB. The authors state that future studies will investigate the mechanism underlying the decreased P-gp and BCRP transporter activity following in vivo exposure and the disposition and pharmacokinetics of FRD-902 at environmentally relevant doses.

4.9.1.2 Immunotoxicity

For a discussion on the immunological effects see the study of Rushing et al. (2017) in Section 4.5.1 and the summary in Section 4.5.4.

4.9.1.3 Endocrine disruption

For the findings on endocrine disruption mode of action in vitro and thyroid hormone changes in vivo, see the description of Conley et al. (2019) in Section 4.8.2.1.

Besides the study of Conley et al. (2019) no other studies are available providing insight into potential endocrine disrupting mode of action for HFPO-DA. Consequently, there is limited data available to conclude on the endocrine properties of the substance. The effects observed in the study by Conley et al. (2019) (i.e. decreases in maternal serum thyroid hormone concentrations) are also consistently seen for other PFASs in vivo in experimental animals (Martin et al., 2007, Thibodeaux et al., 2003, Yu et al., 2009, Conley et al., 2019). The relevance of this observation for human health is however in need of further research as inconsistent results are reported in epidemiological and toxicity studies (ATSDR, 2018). Another issue is the absence of any effect on testosterone production observed by Conley et al. (2019). Both PFOA and HFPO-DA induced Leydig cell tumours in male rats (Cavally Rae et al. 2015). The modulation of testosterone levels is suggested to play an important role in promotion of cell proliferation and testicular Leydig cell tumour development (ECHA, 2011, Klaunig et al., 2012, Sun et al., 2018). More understanding is thus required for potential changes in testosterone levels upon prolonged exposure to HFPO-DA.

4.9.1.4 Specific investigations: other studies

Mechanistic studies

Wang et al. (2017) carried out an oral 28-days study in mice focussed on the induction of liver effects by two test chemicals, i.e. FRD-903 and the tetramer [HFPO-TA]. A single dose level of 1 mg/kg bw/day was tested for both compounds in groups of 12 male ICR mice. Liver weights were increased in both groups, most markedly so in the tetramer group. Furthermore, ALP was increased in both compounds. AST and ALT were increased in the tetramer group only. Moreover,
there was an increase in low-density lipoprotein cholesterol and decreases in total and direct bilirubin. Liver histopathology showed damage in both groups (hepatocellular hypertrophy, lipid droplet accumulation, swollen hepatocytes, and nuclei, steatosis, karyolysis) with the tetramer showing additional adverse effects such as focal cell necrosis, infiltration of inflammatory cells and vacuolar degeneration. The severity of these effects was not indicated. High throughput RNA-sequence data from liver tissues were generated to study the mechanism of the liver damage. In the dimer and tetramer groups 146 and 1295 transcripts, respectively, were changed, with lipid metabolism associated genes being dominant. Many genes of the PPAR-pathway were induced. The authors suggest that the fact that the effect by the tetramer was larger than that for the dimer, endorses the notion that PFAS chain length is an important variable for their hepatotoxicity.

Sheng et al. (2018) studied the in vitro cytotoxicity of FRD-903, the acid trimer of HFPO, and the acid tetramer of HFPO in human liver HL-7702 cell line and compared the results with those for PFOA and PFOS. In addition, the binding mode and affinity to human liver fatty acid binding protein (hL-FABP) was determined for each of these test compounds. The acid trimer and tetramer of HFPO showed greater cytotoxicity compared to PFOA and PFOS (no result presented for the acid dimer). Binding affinity to hL-FABP was lower than that for PFOS and PFOA for the acid dimer of HFPO, higher than PFOA (and equal to PFOS) for the acid trimer of HFPO and higher than both PFOS and PFOA for the acid tetramer of HFPO. The binding to hL-FABP in a 15-Å gorge was predicted with molecular docking, indicating that the HFPO-derived chemicals had greater binding activity. According to the study authors, their results suggest that the oxygen atom inserted in the molecule and the longer chain length are variables linked with a stronger effect on hepatic fatty acid metabolism.

Li et al. (2019) studied the binding affinity, agonistic activity, and adipogenesis activity of HFPO-DA, HFPO-TA and PFOA for the PPARγ receptor in vitro. In a competitive binding assay, all three chemicals showed binding affinity towards human and mouse PPARγ ligand binding domains (LBDs) in a dose-dependent manner. HFPO-TA illustrated 4.8–7.5 fold higher binding affinity compared to PFOA (mouse and human PPARγ respectively), whereas HFPO-DA illustrated lower binding capacity compared to PFOA (IC50 of HFPO-DA was beyond detection). Furthermore, the binding of HFPO-DA, HFPO-TA, and PFOA was predicted with molecular docking. This analysis illustrated that all three compounds could form hydrogen bonds with human and mouse PPARγ, but HFPO-TA and PFOA could form more hydrogen bonds with human PPARγ compared to mouse PPARγ, whereas HFPO-DA could bind equally to human and mouse PPARγ. The authors conclude that this may explain the higher binding affinity of the chemicals towards human PPARγ in vitro.

Additionally, Li et al. (2019) note that HFPO-DA, HFPO-TA, and PFOA enhanced human and mouse PPARγ-mediated luciferase transcription activity in HEK 293 cells in a dose-dependent manner, with highest human PPARγ transcriptional activity of 1.2-, 2.7-, and 1.4-fold at 50 μM for HFPO-DA, HFPO-TA, and PFOA respectively. For all three chemicals, human PPARγ agonistic activity was higher compared to the mouse PPARγ agonistic activity. Lastly, HFPO-DA, HFPO-TA, and PFOA caused increased lipid accumulation and adipogenesis activity in primary human preadipocytes (Hpa-s) and mouse 3T3-L1 preadipocytes in vitro upon 10 days of exposure in the order of HFPO-DA > PFOA > HFPO-DA, and caused significantly increased expression level of adipogenic genes in Hpa-s and 3T3-L1 cells. All in all, these results show that all three chemicals bind to PPARγ, show agonistic activity, and cause increased adipogenesis activity, in the order HFPO-DA > PFOA > HFPO-DA, with adipogenesis being a more sensitive end-point in human preadipocytes compared to mouse preadipocytes.

Mixture toxicity

PFASs often occur together as contamination in soil, groundwater or drinking water. To be able to better assess the risks of this type of contamination, the RIVM investigated the extent to which it is possible to express the harmfulness of a number of PFASs in relation to PFOA. In Zeilmaker et al. (2018), so-called Relative Potency Factors (RPFs) were derived for several perfluorocarboxylic acids (PFCAs), perfluorosulfonic acids (PFsAs) and HFPO-DA, to allow for risk assessment of combined toxicity to a mixture of PFASs based on the principle of dose-addition (EFSA, 2008, EFSA, 2013). This concept is developed for several PFASs, assuming that they act in a similar manner, with the same mechanism/mode of action, resulting in dose-responses with the same
shape but with different potencies for each of the individual substances (see Figure 26). Based on available subacute and subchronic oral toxicity studies in rodents, relative potency factors (RPFs) were derived for 20 individual PFASs, including HFPO-DA.

Table 33: Relative Potency Factors (RPFs) derived for several PFCAs, PFSAs and HFPO-DA from relative liver weight data. RPFs values using PFOA as the Index Compound, obtained from Zeilmaker et al. (2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PFAS group</th>
<th>PFAS</th>
<th>RPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFSA</td>
<td>Perfluorobutanesulfonate (PFBS)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoropentane sulfonic acid (PFPeS)</td>
<td>0.001 ≤ RPF ≤ 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroheptanesulfonate (PFHxS)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroheptane sulfonic acid (PFHpS)</td>
<td>0.6 ≤ RPF ≤ 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroctanesulfonate (PFOS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorodecane sulfonic acid (PFDS)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFCA</td>
<td>Perfluorobutyrate (PFBA)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoropentanoic acid (PFPeA)</td>
<td>0.01 ≤ RPF ≤ 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorohexanoate (PFHxA)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroheptanoic acid (PFHpA)</td>
<td>0.01 ≤ RPF ≤ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorononaic acid (PFNA)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorodecanoic acid (PFDA)</td>
<td>4 ≤ RPF ≤ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluoroundecanoic acid (PFUnDA)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorododecanoic acid (PFDoDA)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorotridecanoic acid (PFTrDA)</td>
<td>0.3 ≤ RPF ≤ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorotertadecanoic acid (PFTeDA)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorohexadecanoic acid (PFHxDA)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perfluorooctadecanoic acid (PFODA)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFECA</td>
<td>Hexafluoropropylene oxide-dimer acid (HFPO-DA)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In principle, the RPF method scales the dose of each substance, according to its potency, to a dose of the Index (reference) Compound (IC), with the IC having a RPF equal to 1 (Table 33). In this particular case, the IC is PFOA. Combining the occurrence of each mixture component with its specific RPF value then expresses each of the mixture components in terms of IC equivalents. Summing over all mixture components then leads to mixture exposure expressed in term of IC equivalents. Subsequently, the latter can be compared with IC Health Based Guidance Value (HBGV), i.e. the HBGV of PFOA. Note that the methodology presented in this report is based on effects on the liver as observed in animal studies.

Hence, based on the proposed RPFs for 20 PFASs in Zeilmaker et al. (2018), the combined effect on the liver can be estimated. It must be noted that many more PFASs exist that might contribute as well. However, derivation of RPFs for these substances is not possible at this moment, as insufficient data are available.
Figure 26: Dose responses of relative liver weight (in male rat) of a series of individual PFASs after normalising to background. The dose responses have the same shape, i.e. the curves are parallel on the log-dose scale, but each PFAS has a different potency: different doses are required to result in the same increase in response.

Gomis et al. (2018) investigated to what extent distribution and elimination kinetics influence toxicological effect thresholds (which are expressed as administered dose) established for fluorinated alternatives and their predecessors (i.e. PFBA, PFBS, PFHxA, HFPO-DA, PFOA, PFOS). A male rat dynamic one compartment toxicokinetic (TK) model was used to calculate internal doses of these substances in serum and in liver, based on equipotent external doses derived from dose-response curves of liver enlargement in subchronic oral rat toxicity studies. The authors observed that converting external doses to internal serum and liver concentrations resulted in reduced variability in the dose-response curves of PFBA, PFHxA, PFOA and HFPO-DA. They concluded that HFPO-DA interacts more strongly with its target (i.e. has a higher toxic potency) than its predecessor PFOA when correcting for differences in toxicokinetics. More precisely, ranking the substances based on toxic potency resulted in HFPO-DA > PFOA > PFHxA > PFBA and HFPO-DA > PFOA ≈ PFHxA ≈ PFBA for internal concentrations in serum and liver respectively. For PFOS and PFBS, no differences in potency were observed based on internal and external doses.

4.9.2 Summary and discussion of other effects – human health

Richards et al. (2018) report an abstract of an ex vivo neurotoxicity study for FRD-902 using rat brain capillaries. The effect on the blood brain barrier (BBB) was examined by measuring the effect at FRD-902 on efflux transporters (P-gp, BCRP, MRP2). A concentration-related decrease in P-gp and BCRP activity was found, indicative of potential reduction of the protective function of the BBB.

Rushing et al. (2017) observed suppression of the T cell-dependent antibody response in females and increased T lymphocyte numbers in males exposed to the substance at a dose of 100 mg/kg bw/day for 28 days. The authors of the study conclude that these observations are in line with parameters affected by PFOA, albeit FRD-903 appears to be less potent, and further studies are required to determine the full immunomodulatory profile of FRD-903 and possible synergism with other PFAS compounds.
Wang et al. (2017) illustrated the effect of FRD-903 (HFPO dimer acid) upon the liver in mice, and furthermore conducted high-throughput RNA sequencing on these liver tissues. Liver weights were increased in both groups and liver histopathology showed damage (i.e. hepatocellular hypertrophy, lipid droplet accumulation, swollen hepatocytes, and nuclei, steatosis, karyolysis). In the liver tissue, 146 transcripts were changed, with lipid metabolism associated genes being dominant, and many genes of the PPAR-pathway were induced. The authors suggest that PFAS chain length is an important variable for hepatotoxicity.

Sheng et al. (2018) report that the in vitro cytotoxicity of FRD-903 and related compounds in human liver HL-7702 cell line, and the binding mode and affinity to human liver fatty acid binding protein (hL-FABP) was studied. However, in the study no cytotoxicity result was presented for FRD-903. Binding affinity to hL-FABP was lower for FRD-903 than that for PFOS and PFOA. According to the study authors their results suggest that the oxygen atom inserted in the molecule and the longer chain length are variables linked with a stronger effect on hepatic fatty acid metabolism.

Zeilmaker et al. (2018) established relative potency factors (RPFs) to be able to evaluate combined exposure to mixtures of PFASs. As these substances (perfluoro carboxylic acids, perfluoro sulphonic acids, and perfluoro ether carboxylic acids) are assumed to cause liver toxicity by a similar mechanism/mode of action, dose-addition is justified. With the proposed RPFs, the combined effect on the liver for 20 PFASs can be estimated, using IC equivalents. Due to current absence of toxicity data for many PFASs, no RPF can be calculated for these substances.

Gomis et al. (2018) investigated to that extent the toxicokinetics of PFASs influence the toxicological effect threshold. They concluded that HFPO-DA interacts more strongly with its target than its predecessor PFOA (i.e. HFPO-DA has a higher toxic potency) when correcting for toxicokinetics. Ranking the substances based on toxic potency resulted in HFPO-DA > PFOA > PFHxA > PFBA and HFPO-DA > PFOA ≈ PFHxA ≈ PFBA for internal concentrations in serum and liver respectively. For PFOS and PFBS, no differences in potency were observed based on internal and external doses.

### 4.10 Reference values

An overview of the existing reference values for HFPO-DA is provided in Table 34. The registrant derived worker DNELs of 0.02 mg/kg bw/day for dermal exposure and 0.14 mg/m³ for inhalation, based on a NOAEL of 1 mg/kg bw/day for liver toxicity obtained from a 2-year chronic toxicity study in rats. For consumers, the registrant derived a DNEL of 0.04 mg/m³ for inhalation and 0.01 mg/kg bw/day for oral exposure. The registrant DNEL derivation is in line with the ECHA Guidance for derivation of DNELs (ECHA, 2012a). However, the derivation of limit values below which exposure to HFPO-DA or its salts/acid can be considered safe is hampered by uncertainty, as illustrated in the paragraphs below.

**Table 34:** Reference values for HFPO-DA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>NOAEL</th>
<th>POD</th>
<th>NOAEC</th>
<th>BMD₁₀</th>
<th>Assessment factors (AFs)</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tTDI inhalation general population</td>
<td>(Beekman et al., 2016)</td>
<td>0.1 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Change in A/G ratio in male rats (Caverly Rae et al., 2015)</td>
<td>0.087 mg/m³</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Additional toxicokinetics AF: 66 Interspecies remaining toxicodynamics AF: 1.8 Intraspecies AF: 10 Total AF: 1188</td>
<td>73 ng/m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tTDI oral general population</td>
<td>(Janssen, 2017)¹</td>
<td>0.1 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Change in A/G ratio in male rats (Caverly Rae et al., 2015)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Additional toxicokinetics AF: 66 Interspecies toxicokinetics AF: 4 Interspecies remaining toxicodynamics AF: 1.8 Intraspecies AF: 10</td>
<td>21 ng/kg bw/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>NOAEL</th>
<th>POD</th>
<th>NOAEC</th>
<th>BMD 10</th>
<th>Assessment factors (AFs)</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provisional guideline value drinking water general population</td>
<td>(Janssen, 2017)</td>
<td>0.1 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Change in A/G ratio in male rats (Caverly Rae et al., 2015)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Additional toxicokinetics AF: 66 Interspecies toxicokinetics AF: 4 Interspecies remaining toxicodynamics AF: 1.8 Intraspecies AF: 10 Total AF: 4752</td>
<td>150 ng/L&lt;sup&gt;46&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional drinking water equivalent level (DWEL) general population</td>
<td>(DHHS, 2017)</td>
<td>0.1 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Liver single cell necrosis in male mice (Haas, 2008b, Edwards, 2010a)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Interspecies AF: 10 Intraspecies AF: 10 Subchronic-to-chronic AF: 10 Total AF: 1000</td>
<td>140 ng/L&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subchronic reference dose</td>
<td>(US-EPA, 2018)</td>
<td>0.1 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Liver single cell necrosis in male mice (Edwards, 2010a)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0.15 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Dosimetric scaling AF: 6.67 Interspecies remaining toxicokinetics/toxicodynamics AF: 3 Intraspecies AF: 10 Database uncertainty AF: 3 Total AF: 667&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>200 ng/kg bw/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic reference dose</td>
<td>(US-EPA, 2018)</td>
<td>0.1 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Liver single cell necrosis in male mice (Edwards, 2010a)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0.15 mg/kg bw/day</td>
<td>Dosimetric scaling AF: 6.67 Interspecies remaining toxicokinetics/toxicodynamics AF: 3 Intraspecies AF: 10 Subchronic/chronic AF: 3 Database uncertainty AF: 3 Total AF: 2000&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>80 ng/kg bw/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNEL inhalation general population</td>
<td>REACH Registration Dossier</td>
<td>1 mg/kg b/day</td>
<td>Observed liver and blood effects in male rats (Caverly Rae et al., 2015)</td>
<td>0.87 mg/m&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Interspecies AF other: 2.5 Intraspecies AF: 10 Total AF: 25</td>
<td>0.04 mg/m&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNEL oral general population</td>
<td>REACH Registration Dossier</td>
<td>1 mg/kg b/day</td>
<td>Observed liver and blood effects in male rats (Caverly Rae et al., 2015)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Interspecies AF: 4 Intraspecies AF other: 2.5 Intraspecies AF: 10 Total AF: 100</td>
<td>0.01 mg/kg bw/day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNEL worker inhalation</td>
<td>REACH Registration Dossier</td>
<td>1 mg/kg b/day</td>
<td>Observed liver and blood effects in male rats (Caverly Rae et al., 2015)</td>
<td>1.76 mg/m&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Interspecies AF other: 2.5 Intraspecies AF: 5 Total AF: 12.5</td>
<td>0.14 mg/m&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNEL worker dermal</td>
<td>REACH Registration Dossier</td>
<td>1 mg/kg b/day</td>
<td>Observed liver and blood effects in male rats (Caverly Rae et al., 2015)</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Interspecies AF: 4 Intraspecies AF other: 2.5 Intraspecies AF: 5 Total AF: 50</td>
<td>0.02 mg/kg bw/day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>46</sup> In agreement with the usual method for deriving drinking-water guidelines, 20% of the (t)TDI is allocated to drinking-water. Using a standard adult body weight of 70 kg and a standard drinking-water consumption of 2 L per day, leads to a provisional drinking-water guideline value of 150 ng/L.

<sup>49</sup> Using body weight (7.8 kg) and drinking water intake of bottle fed infants (1.1 L) and a relative source contribution of 20% to account for exposure to HFPO-DA via other sources.

<sup>40</sup> Using the round-off value of 3x3x10=100

<sup>30</sup> Using the round-off value of 3x3x3x10=300
Janssen and Beekman started from the more sensitive endpoint of immune effects observed with a NOAEL of 0.1 mg/kg bw/day, using the uncertainty factors as recommended in the ECHA Guidance Ch. 8 (ECHA, 2012a). They did not derive DNELs but instead derived tentative Tolerable Daily Intake limit values (TDIs) for the general population of 21 ng/kg bw/day for oral exposure, 73 ng/m³ for inhalation, and 150 ng/L for drinking water. The preliminary status of these TDIs flows from the argument that uncertainty with regard to bioaccumulation in humans should be taken into account as well. Since this information is currently unknown, the authors applied an uncertainty factor of 66 specifically covering uncertainty between bioaccumulation in humans and experimental animals based on the ratio of PFOA half-lives in humans and monkeys (1378/20.9 = 66 ; (Olsen et al., 2007a, Butenhoff et al., 2004)). In the ECHA Guidance Ch. R.8 no specific guidance is given on how to derive a DNEL that covers this specific type of uncertainty.

Also the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services and the US-EPA derived human health guidance values (US-EPA, 2018, DHHS, 2017), for drinking water and oral intake in general. For the latter it must be specifically stated that the US-EPA report is a draft for review purposes only and does not constitute US-EPA policy. In the US-EPA preliminary report, a subchronic reference dose (RfD) of 200 ng/kg bw/day and a chronic RfD of 80 ng/kg bw/day were derived. These values were based on the effect of liver single cell necrosis in male mice observed in the reproductive/developmental toxicity screening study (Edwards, 2010a). In addition to an uncertainty factor related to dosimetric scaling, interspecies remaining differences, intraspecies differences, and a subchronic-to-chronic uncertainty factor (for the chronic RfD only), the US-EPA also applied an additional assessment factor to account for deficiencies in the database of HFPO-DA (e.g. limited information available on developmental toxicity and immunological responses, lack of a chronic study in mice, and insufficient data present to determine whether the observed haematological effects should be considered critical).

Albeit based on different points of departure and different rationale, both US-EPA (2018) and Janssen (2017) conclude on oral health based guidance values below 0.1 μg/kg bw/day. The 2 to 3 orders of magnitude difference between human health guidance values presented in Table 34 can mainly be attributed to the use of different points of departure and the use of additional safety factors by Beekman et al. (2016), Janssen (2017), and US-EPA (2018). Both RIVM and the US-EPA note deficiencies in the current database of HFPO-DA, compelling them to deal with considerable uncertainty in the derivation of limits below which exposure to humans can be considered safe. Identification of these knowledge gaps gives rise to concern regarding effects on human health.

4.11 Summary and discussion of human health hazard assessment

In summary, main target organs upon subchronic and chronic exposure to FRD-902 in mice and rats include the liver, the kidney, the haematologic system, and the immune system. Moreover, exposure to HFPO-DA resulted in early deliveries, and decreased birth weight of pups. Observed differences in HFPO-DA clearance between males and females could explain higher sensitivity of males compared to females. Furthermore, the data illustrate that HFPO-DA induces tumours in the liver, pancreas, and testes in rats upon chronic exposure.

Information is inconclusive with respect to potential effects on fertility and development. Additionally, whereas the immune system seems to be affected upon treatment with HFPO-DA, there is little information available, which hampers full assessment of the immunomodulatory effects of HFPO-DA. The same applies to potential endocrine disrupting effects (e.g. changes in testosterone levels), as well as mechanistic studies targeting protein binding and toxicogenomics. Lastly, in the absence of appropriate human data for HFPO-DA, a solid conclusion on the half-life in humans cannot be drawn.

5 Environmental hazard assessment

The environmental hazards of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof) were not considered as first priority in the context of the present support document to motivate the very
high concern for these substances that lead to identification as SVHC according to art. 57(f) of REACH. Indeed, direct ecotoxicity of HFPO-DA to aquatic species, such as algae, daphnids and fish, is generally low (Smit, 2017, Rutgers et al., 2019), no data for direct ecotoxicity to terrestrial species (e.g. earthworms, plants) are available. However, birds and mammals are more sensitive to HFPO-DA and the toxicity towards birds and mammals is relevant for secondary poisoning. This may lead to relatively stringent safety levels for secondary poisoning (Rutgers et al., 2019).

For the assessment of secondary poisoning of birds and mammals, the same data are used that have been described for assessing human toxicology in Section 4. However, to assess concerns for secondary poisoning, only information is used on endpoints that are relevant on a population level, i.e. related to survival, growth and reproduction. A detailed description of this assessment has been conducted and reported by Rutgers et al. (2019). It was concluded that mice were most sensitive to possible effects of HFPO-DA, followed by rats and quail. Effects observed in birds are not part of the human-toxicological assessment, but are included in the assessment by Rutgers et al. (2019). From the information available it was concluded that the only bird species tested for possible adverse effects of HFPO-DA was less sensitive to its effects compared to the rodents. At 5 mg/kg per day, mouse male and female F1 pups exhibited significantly lower mean body weights compared to controls at PNDs 4, 7, 14, 21 and 28, with decreases reaching over 20% at weaning (i.e. PND 21). Male F1 pups continued to exhibit significantly lower mean body weights at PNDs 35 and 40 (~10%). The weight of the female F1 pups returned to control group mean body weight values at PNDs 35 and 40. The NOAEL of 0.5 mg/kg bw/d for growth of the F1 generation of mice was selected as most critical endpoint relevant for secondary poisoning (see section 4.8.1.1). This value was corrected for the purity and for the contribution of the ammonium ion to 0.398 mg/kg bw/d.

The methodology for secondary poisoning was adapted from Verbruggen (2014), which is included in the updated Technical Guidance for Deriving Environmental Quality Standards (EC, 2018). This methodology is versatile with regard to the inclusion of different food chains and allows for the route via herbivorous wildlife in the terrestrial environment. It is recognised that this methodology is not described in REACH guidance R16. Guidance R16 does provide a methodology on secondary poisoning. However, this methodology is limited to food chains based on fish and earthworms.

Based on allometric scaling on basis of the body weight for the parents (56.6 g, the F1 generation was exposed through the parents), the mice have a daily energy expenditure of 117 kJ/d (regression between the daily energy expenditure of mammals and the amount of energy they need on a daily basis). This equals 89 g/d of leaf vegetables (leaf vegetables contain 1311 kJ/kg fwt). The NOAEL expressed can be recalculated as a concentration in leaf vegetables by first multiplying the dose by the ratio of the body weight and the daily energy expenditure. This value is then multiplied by the energy content of the food. The resulting NOEC expressed as a concentration in leaf vegetables is 0.25 mg/kg fwt. For a safety level comparable to the PNEC for secondary poisoning, next to an assessment factor of 3 for study duration, only an assessment factor of 10 has been applied to extrapolate from the most sensitive species to all birds and mammals in the ecosystem, which results in a safety level for herbivorous wildlife of 8.4 µg/kg fwt in leaf vegetables. In this value, as of yet unknown biomagnification in the terrestrial food chain has not been taken into account. In the more cautious value of 2.6 µg/kg fwt derived by Rutgers et al. (2019), a biomagnification step equal to that for PFOA has been taken into account to protect the predators of these herbivorous wildlife as well. A similar value for fish can be derived by using the energy content of fish (5534 kJ/kg). The NOEC expressed as a concentration in fish is then 1.1 mg/kg fwt. A safety level for fish-eating wildlife would then be 36 µg/kg fwt.

Comparison to the available information on HFPO-DA presence in the environment from monitoring data suggests that maximum concentrations in fish and terrestrial plants (leaf vegetables) near known emission sources are in the same order of magnitude as the safety levels derived for herbivorous and fish-eating wildlife (see sections 3.4 and 3.5).

A reason for relatively stringent safety levels for wildlife is that plants or fish are the sole energy source for herbivorous and fish-eating wildlife, respectively, leading to a relatively high intake compared to humans. Hence, HFPO-DA exposure may be of concern to wildlife via secondary poisoning. Wildlife is considered as a relevant protection goal for HFPO-DA as it is for PBT/vPvB substances. It is noted that that there is a significant difference between the level of secondary
poisoning concern resulting from a risk assessment (part of the CSR), and the secondary poisoning concern for PBT/vPvB substances (at an SVHC level). The comparability of HFPO-DA with PBT/vPvB substances is discussed further in Section 6.3.2.8.

6 Conclusions on the SVHC Properties

6.1 CMR assessment

Not relevant for the identification of the substances as SVHC in accordance with Article 57 (f) of REACH Regulation.

6.2 PBT and vPvB assessment

Not relevant for the identification of the substances as SVHC in accordance with Article 57 (f) of REACH Regulation.

6.3 Assessment under Article 57(f)

An assessment is made in order to conclude whether 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof), further denoted as HFPO-DA, should be regarded as "substances for which there is scientific evidence of probable serious effects to human health and the environment which give rise to an equivalent level of concern to those of other substances listed in Article 57 points (a) to (e) of the REACH Regulation”.

This case-by-case assessment is done on the basis of the information available on the different substances in the group applying a weight of evidence approach. All studies and publications referenced in this Support Document are considered relevant to evaluate the equivalent level of concern for HFPO-DA, and are used in the weight of evidence assessment. Despite the fact that some studies are not conducted according to OECD guidelines, or may not be considered highly relevant as standalone studies, there is no reason to discard any study on the basis of reliability.

6.3.1 Summary of the data on the substance properties and other evidence

6.3.1.1 Degradation – abiotic and biotic

The available information discussed in detail in section 3.1 clearly shows that the degradation of HFPO-DA is very low to negligible under environmentally relevant conditions. QSAR modelling and the different tests exploring ready or inherent biodegradability show that HFPO-DA does not exhibit any primary biodegradation, is not readily or inherently biodegradable and is not structurally transformed under the experimental test conditions. Experimental data suggest that under abiotic conditions HFPO-DA may be more persistent than PFOA. This very high persistence observed for HFPO-DA is a property that is also observed for other perfluorinated substances and can be attributed to the full fluorination of the carbon chain (see Section 3.1). Monitoring data provide further support to the very high persistency showing the presence of HFPO-DA in remote places where there is no indication of a possible direct emission source (see Section 3.2.5). Based on the available experimental and QSAR information on HFPO-DA, it is concluded that HFPO-DA meets the P and vP-criteria of REACH Annex XIII by far (see also section 6.3.2.8).

6.3.1.2 Bioaccumulation

Bioaccumulation of HFPO-DA in humans and the environment is as of yet uncertain. The ongoing Substance Evaluation on FRD-902 aims to generate further information on the bioaccumulation
potential of FRD-902 (and thereby on HFPO-DA) in humans to clarify amongst others the concern for risks to workers and suspected PBT/vPvB properties. Though possible bioaccumulation of HFPO-DA in humans is of concern (as is summarised below), this concern will not be brought forward as an element in the equivalent level of concern assessment because of the outstanding issues that are under discussion in the ongoing Substance Evaluation on FRD-902.

**Information from environmental data**

Few data are available on the bioaccumulation potential for HFPO-DA in the aquatic environment. Laboratory bioconcentration factors (BCF) and field bioaccumulation factors (BAF) are low (Hoke et al., 2016, Pan et al., 2017, NVWA, 2018, NCDEQ, 2018c, Goodband, 2019). Based on the available data on HFPO-DA and its structural similarities with other PFASs, it is concluded that bioaccumulation may depend on the external water concentration of HFPO-DA. This is similar to what is observed for PFOA (Verbruggen et al., 2017). HFPO-DA is found in fish in three field studies, one in China, one in the US (North Carolina) and one in the Netherlands. The data available suggest that bioaccumulation of HFPO-DA is influenced by the presence of other PFASs in the same environment, like for example PFOA. Hence, in the presence of other fluorocarbons, competition for uptake seems to occur.

The BCF of HFPO-DA may depend on the environmental conditions (e.g. concentration of HFPO-DA in the water and likely also co-exposure of environmental organisms to HFPO-DA and other PFASs). The BCF of HFPO-DA seems slightly lower than the BCF of PFOA (see also Section 1.3 and Annex II for a further motivation of the similarities in properties between different PFASs). A reliable assessment of the bioaccumulation potential of HFPO-DA is a prerequisite for quantitative risk assessment, for estimation of exposure of man via environment and secondary poisoning, that underly the derivation of a water quality standard for HFPO-DA for these routes (Smit, 2017). With the concentration dependent BCF values an estimate for this environmental bioaccumulation may be derived.

**Information from human data**

HFPO-DA has been found in the serum of residents living close to a fluorochemical plant in China (Pan et al., 2017), and in the blood of employees from a fluorochemical production plant in the Netherlands (Van den Berg, 2017). Concentrations in the Chinese residents were in the order of 0.13 ng/ml (geometric mean) with a 95th percentile at 1.72 ng/ml. HFPO-DA levels in the blood of employees from a Dutch fluorochemical plant varied between <1 and 169 ng/ml, with a median value of 1.55 ng/ml. HFPO-DA was not found in concentrations above the level of detection in the blood of residents in North Carolina (US) that were described to have had a historical exposure to the substance of unspecified exposure level. It is not possible to derive a half-life for HFPO-DA in humans from these data with reasonable certainty. Experimental data in some mammalian species show half-lives between hours and several days (Gannon et al. (2016); see also Section 4.1.1.5). As described in Section 4.1.2 for PFOA, the half-life in humans of 3.8 years (Olsen et al., 2007b) is much higher than would be expected based on data from rodents and monkeys, in which half-lives of 2-4 hours up to 17-19 days were determined (Lau et al., 2007, Butenhoff et al., 2004). Because of this discrepancy between humans and other mammalian species for PFOA, an extrapolation of half-lives of HFPO-DA in mammalian test species to humans may not be straightforward either.

**6.3.1.3 Enrichment in plants**

Monitoring data of HFPO-DA in plants have been collected from vegetables and fruits from kitchen gardens in the vicinity of the fluorochemical plant near Dordrecht in the Netherlands in August 2017 (see Section 3.5). A total of 10 locations were sampled at various distances from the fluorochemical plant. Further information comes from another location in the Netherlands with kitchen gardens with a known emission source nearby. The detected concentrations were significantly different for different types of vegetables with leafy vegetables having the highest concentrations, followed by tuber vegetables and fruit vegetables. Furthermore, the available information hints that HFPO-DA may enrich more strongly in plants than PFOA does and may be more comparable to short-chain PFCAs. The BAF values reflect their mobile character, also in
terrestrial plants. Due to the uptake observed in vegetables and fruits, consumption of these by humans and wildlife may contribute to the total exposure to HFPO-DA.

6.3.1.4 Measured levels of HFPO-DA in surface, sea, rain and ground water

Monitoring data from Europe indicate that HFPO-DA is transported by sea currents over very long distances reaching the North Sea, the Wadden Sea and the German Bight and is further transported to the Norwegian Sea and along the coast of Denmark to enter the Baltic Sea. Concentrations are found to range from 10 - 100 ng/l in the Dutch estuaries to 1 – 10 ng/l in the North Sea and Wadden Sea, and 0.1 - 1 ng/l in the Norwegian Sea, along the coast of Denmark and in the Baltic Sea. For these waters, a clear correlation was found between possible emission sources and the detection of HFPO-DA. HFPO-DA is also detected in surface water at locations for which observed concentrations cannot be explained by any known, local emission source. Concentrations upstream of rivers along which no known fluorochemical production facility is located suggest the presence of diffuse emission sources. Observed concentrations in the Netherlands, the UK, Sweden, China and the US without an apparent emission source present, range between 0.1 – 10 ng/l. Pan et al. (2018) and Hopkins et al. (2018) furthermore report the occurrence of low level background concentrations of HFPO-DA (together with other PFASs like HFPO-TA, and 6:2 H-PFESA) across the global environment in the low ng/l range.

Waste treatment and waste transport are identified as possible sources of diffuse emissions. Another source that could lead to diffuse pollution is emission through air. Monitoring data show the possible dispersion of airborne HFPO-DA in the environment via rain water, and also airborne C3 dimer acid fluoride is mentioned as a possible diffuse source of HFPO-DA. For the plant in Fayetteville NC in the US this acid fluoride was proposed as a significant source leading to the widespread diffuse pollution observed and it was estimated that 225 kg or more was emitted into the air between 2012 and 2016 (Hopkins et al., 2018). For the fluorochemical plant in the Netherlands, recorded air emissions of FRD-902/FRD-903 that could give rise to a diffuse spread of HFPO-DA for 2012 – 2015 lays between 200 – 420 kg/year (Beekman et al., 2016). This emission was used to model the possible exposure in close proximity of the plant at 15 ng/m^3; exposure reduces with longer distance from the plant. Residual HFPO-DA that can be present in low concentrations in PTFE and FEP containing products and articles, as is indicated in the registration dossier, may be another possible source that could give rise to diffuse emissions.

The fact that monitoring data also point to locations where HFPO-DA is not detected in water above the detection limit does not necessarily contradict the finding of a gradual worldwide spread of HFPO-DA. As HFPO-DA transport processes are primarily occurring via the water phase, waters like inland lakes without HFPO-DA using industries nearby are less likely to contain HFPO-DA given its still relatively short historical use.

6.3.1.5 Measured levels of HFPO-DA in drinking water

HFPO-DA is detected in finished drinking water at several locations downstream of the fluorochemical production plant in the Netherlands in concentrations up to 30 ng/l. The raw water for drinking water preparation was extracted from local surface water and a clear correlation was found between possible emission sources and the detection of HFPO-DA in finished drinking water. HFPO-DA was also found in tap water from some other Dutch cities, not located downstream of a fluorochemical plant (see Section 3.2.5). In the Cape Fear River area (NC, USA), concentrations of 400 to 500 ng/L were observed in drinking water in August 2013 abstracted from the river 90 miles downstream of a fluorochemical plant. A month after an emission reduction of HFPO-DA in June 2017, concentrations in drinking water of the water treatment plant 90 miles downstream of the fluorochemical plant dropped from over 700 ng/L to 40-50 ng/L (Hopkins et al., 2018). Data obtained from the North Carolina Environmental Quality website on GenX (HFPO-DA) sampling show that all water treatment plants downstream of the fluorochemical plant have similar concentrations and trends with drinking water concentrations around 40 ng/L by November 2018.
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6.3.1.6 Long range transport

The potential for long range transport of HFPO-DA is modelled and evaluated against the screening criteria as they are included for the potential for long-range environmental transport in Annex D, Section 1 (d) of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). HFPO-DA is modelled to have a characteristic travel distance (CTD) of 5728 km or greater, which indicates that HFPO-DA can reach any area of the world before any significant degradation has occurred. Long range transport is found to occur predominantly via the water compartment. In air, HFPO-DA is modelled to have an atmospheric half-life of 20.57 days, which by far exceeds the criterion in the Stockholm Convention of >2 days. Hence, the modelling of HFPO-DA suggests that this substance has the potential for long range transport and can be transported to remote areas.

The monitoring data for rain water, fresh water and for marine water support the modelling results that HFPO-DA is subject to long range transport over vast distances by air and water. The travelling distances of HFPO-DA from known emission sources to the site of detection can be large (e.g. from the Dutch river delta all the way up to the Norwegian sea). Consequently the monitoring data clearly indicate the potential for long range transport of HFPO-DA.

6.3.1.7 Decontamination and release reduction for removal of HFPO-DA from the environment and from drinking water

The removal of HFPO-DA from the different environmental media is important for e.g. the production of drinking water from raw water and the remediation of contaminated areas to prevent continuous exposure of the environment and humans via the environment. Release reduction via e.g. the reduction of industrial emissions and decontamination by water remediation techniques are two methods to possibly reduce HFPO-DA water concentrations or fully remove HFPO-DA from the environment and from drinking water.

HFPO-DA has a low sorption potential. The registration dossier of FRD-902 reports a log $K_{oc}$ of 1.1. Sun et al. (2016) studied the removal of HFPO-DA by powdered activated carbon (PAC) under laboratory conditions, simulating maximum efficiency water treatment processes, and its removal at the different steps of the actual drinking water treatment process. They found that PAC was to some extent able to remove HFPO-DA from water. The removal efficiency was higher than for PFBA, but lower than for PFHxA, PFBS, PFOA and PFOS. Study of the actual drinking water treatment process nevertheless indicated no significant removal of HFPO-DA in any of the water treatment steps, suggesting that in practice the possibility to remove HFPO-DA from drinking water is poor at best (Sun et al., 2016). Hopkins et al. (2018) and Roelandse and Timmer (2017) confirmed this observation for current possibilities for surface water treatment, noting that HFPO-DA is very difficult to remove from the water phase and that methods available to possibly remove HFPO-DA from the water phase may not be effective in practice and may be highly energy demanding. HFPO-DA can in principle be removed from the water phase using either one of the techniques Reversed Osmosis (Albergamo et al., 2019) or Nanofiltration (Reemtsma et al., 2016). Both techniques were stated to be highly energy demanding and efficient in removing polar compounds from the water phase. It was indicated that these techniques will result in 25% of the water becoming waste, water companies having to remineralise the water and an additional overall cost to society on the order of €1,-/m$^3$ drinking water. It may be possible to significantly reduce HFPO-DA concentrations by 99% using active carbon beds. However, further information on the associated costs, energy demands, and practical implementation of this technique for water purification other than for industrial emission reduction were not specified. Managing water and drinking water concentrations would require appropriate analysis techniques to monitor the presence of HFPO-DA. It is noted that these analysis techniques are costly and are not commonly used by drinking water companies to perform their quality control (Perez et al., 2016). While large water supply companies may be able to afford the required technology, it can prove too expensive for smaller suppliers who then resort to outsourcing analyses to private laboratories when adhering to legislated measurement requirements.

6.3.1.8 Toxicokinetics

The available data indicate that HFPO-DA is quickly absorbed in mammals after oral exposure,
and distributes mainly to the plasma and liver. Male rats and mice showed overall higher HFPO-DA tissue and plasma concentrations compared to females upon exposure to equipotent dosages, which might be explained by more effective elimination in females compared to males. Data furthermore indicate that the substance distributes into the foetus, and that there is limited transfer of HFPO-DA via lactation. The substance is not metabolised, and is eliminated almost completely within approximately 24 hours via urine in rats and monkeys, and it takes up to 7 days to be fully retrieved in the urine from mice.

The half-lives established in experimental animals vary between one and several days. As described in Section 4.1.1.5 for PFOA and other PFASs, for which human half-lives are reported (Wang et al., 2015), values are much higher as would be expected based on allometric scaling. Because of the observed discrepancy between humans and tested mammals for other PFASs, an extrapolation of half-lives of HFPO-DA in mammalian test species to humans may not be straightforward either. These limitations in the available knowledge mean that the half-life for HFPO-DA in humans remains currently unknown. In order to resolve part of these limitations, the potential for bioaccumulation in humans is under investigation in the ongoing Substance Evaluation on HFPO-DA, where a human biomonitoring study in volunteering workers at the manufacturing site is being requested.

**Protein binding**

The limited data available suggest that HFPO-DA binds to proteins. The substance is mainly distributed to the plasma and the liver. More general observations for PFASs indicating chain length dependent binding to proteins, with higher chain-length leading to better protein-binding efficacy. In comparison to the classic lipophilic organic pollutants that primarily bind to fatty tissues, perfluoro carboxylic acids and perfluoro sulphonic acids primarily bind to proteins. Over 98% of the molecules are bound to serum proteins (mainly albumin) or bind to fatty acid-binding proteins in the liver. For the shorter chain substances, the free fraction in the blood increases with increasing concentrations, suggesting saturation of the binding sites. There are no studies available investigating direct binding between HFPO-DA and albumin, and therefore it currently remains unknown whether HFPO-DA interacts with albumin directly or not.

**Organic Anion Transporter binding**

It is argued that the half-life of PFOA is longer in humans compared to other species, since in humans there could be stronger PFOA reabsorption from ultrafiltrate in the kidney back into the blood by organic anion transporters (OATs) (Yang et al., 2010). No data is available on OAT efficacy for HFPO-DA in humans. It is therefore not known what effect HFPO-DA has on the functioning of the OATs and if resorption of HFPO-DA in the lumen of the kidney will occur in humans or not.

6.3.1.9 **Effects on human health - toxicity**

As lined out in Section 4.11, main target organs upon subchronic and chronic exposure to HFPO-DA in mice and rats include the liver, the kidney, the haematologic system, and the immune system. Furthermore, HFPO-DA crosses the placenta and distributes into the foetus, causes early deliveries and decreased gravid uterine weight, and results in decreased birth weight in pups. Moreover, the toxicity data available illustrate that HFPO-DA induces tumours in the liver, pancreas, and testes in rats upon chronic exposure.

HFPO-DA does not have a harmonised classification (see Section 2). Below a summary is provided of the adverse health effects of highest concern.

**Repeated dose toxicity**

The information available shows that the main target organs of HFPO-DA identified in rodent studies after repeated exposure are the liver, the kidney, the haematological system and the immune system. All these effects are considered of concern. The overall NOAEL resulting from these studies is 0.1 mg/kg bw/day, based on an increase in A/G ratio observed in male rats dosed 1 mg/kg bw/day for two years.
Liver

The liver is the main target organ following from exposure to HFPO-DA via the oral route. A detailed description of the effects observed and possible underlying mechanisms can be found in Section 4.5.1.1. It cannot be excluded that a mechanism other than peroxisome proliferation via the PPARα receptor is responsible for the observed liver effects, giving rise to concern for human health. Effects observed are liver weight increases, serum liver enzyme increases up to 1000 fold in male mice, and microscopical changes of which some remained after 4 weeks post-exposure. These microscopical changes include increases in liver hypertrophy in rats and mice of both sexes, repeatedly accompanied by single-cell-, (multi)focal-, and/or hepatocellular necrosis. In addition, one study observed steatosis.

Kidney

Kidney effects were observed upon exposure to HFPO-DA (i.e. increased kidney weight, kidney hypertrophy, increases in BUN, microscopically observed kidney damage). These effects generally occur at higher dosages than the observed liver effects. Increased kidney weight was accompanied with increased BUN in several studies, but in the cases where kidney hypertrophy was observed, this was not accompanied by histopathological changes in the kidney, apart from the 500 mg/kg bw/day dosed females in the chronic study (Craig, 2013). Furthermore, in male mice dosed for 85 days in the reproduction/developmental screening study, increased incidence of kidney tubular cell hypertrophy was observed at 0.5 mg/kg bw/day and 5 mg/kg bw/day. The biological relevance of the increases in BUN and the kidney hypertrophy without any microscopically observed kidney damage is unclear.

Haematological system

Changes in the haematological system include red cell mass reduction and decreased haemoglobin and haematocrit. Other observations include increases in absolute reticulocytes, platelets and decreases in basophilis. These changes suggest that exposure to HFPO-DA may promote anaemia. These changes were overall relatively mild, with parameters not exceeding 10% change from control up to dosages of 50 mg/kg bw/day in a chronic study in rats. However, data from female rats dosed at 1000 mg/kg bw/day under a subchronic exposure regimen illustrate that HFPO-DA may promote severe anaemic conditions.

Immune system

Effects on the immune system include increases in albumin and decreases in globulin (and accompanied increases in A/G ratio). These changes may be considered indicators of potentially reduced immune function. Furthermore, these changes were accompanied by decreases in spleen weight around the same concentration. At higher doses, suppression of the T cell-dependent antibody response and increased T lymphocyte numbers were observed. Whereas the immune system seems to be affected upon treatment with HFPO-DA, there is little information available, which hampers full assessment of the immunomodulatory effects of HFPO-DA.

Carcinogenicity

The information available demonstrates statistically significant induction of adenomas/carcinomas in the pancreas in males at 50 mg/kg bw/day, statistically significant induction of hepatocellular adenomas and carcinomas in females at 500 mg/kg bw/day, and increased incidence of Leydig cell tumours in the testes at 50 mg/kg bw/day.

The information available does indicate a non-genotoxic mechanism. HFPO-DA induced liver carcinogenicity may be caused via the PPARα mode of action. This mode of action would be specific for rodents. However, it cannot be excluded that another mechanism may be responsible for the observed liver tumours, nor is there a direct link between PPARα and the observed pancreatic and testes tumours established. More specific, for HFPO-DA, it is uncertain whether PPARα activation is required for the liver tumours observed to develop, and the underlying mode of action for the
Leydig cell- and pancreatic acinar tumour types remains unclear. Therefore, HFPO-DA is considered potentially carcinogenic to humans. Data are currently insufficient to conclude on the full carcinogenic potential of HFPO-DA. The undergoing Substance Evaluation requests more information to elucidate this concern.

**Fertility and developmental toxicity**

No effects on reproduction were observed at any of the dose levels tested. In the parental animals, liver single-cell necrosis was observed in males, in concordance with the effects observed in the subchronic and chronic toxicity studies. Furthermore, F1 animals of both sexes showed decreased mean body weight during the pre-weaning period, and during the weaning period (m). However, the results from the developmental/reproduction screening study in mice do not allow for final conclusions regarding the reproductive effects because the highest dose level tested only exerted minimal effects in the parental animals. Therefore, information is regarded inconclusive with respect to potential effects to the reproductive system.

With regard to developmental toxicity, HFPO-DA crosses the placenta and distributes into the fetus, causes early deliveries, decreased gravid uterine weight, and results in decreased birth weight in pups without causing severe parental toxicity at 100 mg/kg bw/day. No effects were found on foetal survival, malformations, or on variations, besides a higher incidence of 14th rudimentary ribs at 1000 mg/kg bw/day.

### 6.3.1.10 Reference values

An overview of and discussion on the derivation of tTDI’s, DNELs, and RFDs is provided in Section 4.10. Albeit based on different points of departure and different rationale, both US-EPA (2018) and Janssen (2017) conclude on oral health based guidance values below 0.1 μg/kg bw/day. The 2 to 3 orders of magnitude difference in human health guidance values can mainly be attributed to the use of different points of departure and the use of additional safety factors by Beekman et al. (2016), Janssen (2017), and US-EPA (2018). Both RIVM and the US-EPA note deficiencies in the current database of HFPO-DA, compelling them to deal with considerable uncertainty in the derivation of limits below which exposure to HFPO-DA can be considered safe for humans. Identification of these knowledge gaps gives rise to concern regarding effects on human health. These guidance values are included in this Support Document solely for the purpose of illustrating some further perspective on the possible evaluation of effects observed in mammals, their representativeness for possible effects on human health and the existing uncertainties.

### 6.3.1.11 Environmental toxicity and secondary poisoning

The direct toxicity of HFPO-DA to aquatic and terrestrial species, such as algae, daphnids, fish, earthworms and plants, is assumed to be low and was not considered as first priority in the context of the present equivalent level of concern assessment. However, concern for secondary poisoning may be significant, as birds and mammals show more toxic effects of HFPO-DA than lower organisms. Relatively stringent safety levels may result from the fact that a particular food item such as terrestrial plants and fish are often the sole energy source for a specific mammalian or avian species, leading to a relatively high HFPO-DA intake. Hence, HFPO-DA exposure may be of concern to wildlife and secondary poisoning is therefore considered as a relevant endpoint for the equivalent level of concern assessment (see also section 5).

### 6.3.1.12 Co-exposure with other PFECAs and PFASs

As is described in Section 4.9.1.4, monitoring data indicate that often more than one PFAS can be identified in environmental samples suggesting that PFASs are likely to co-occur as contamination in soil, groundwater or drinking water. Zeilmaker et al. (2018) derived so-called Relative Potency Factors (RPFs) for several perfluorocarboxylic acids (PFCAs), perfluorosulphonic acids (PFSAs) and HFPO-DA, to allow for risk assessment of combined toxicity to a mixture of PFASs based on the principle of dose-addition. This concept is developed assuming that the PFASs act in a similar manner, with the same mechanism/mode of action, resulting in dose-responses with the same shape but with different potencies for each of the individual substances. In principle, the RPF...
method scales the dose of each substance, according to its potency. Based on available subacute and subchronic oral toxicity studies in rodents, relative potency factors (RPFs) were derived for 20 individual PFASs, including HFPO-DA. From this work is derived that the potency of e.g. PFOA > PFTeDA > HFPO-DA > PFHxA > PFHxDA > PFBS. Hence, based on the proposed RPFs for 20 PFASs in Zeilmaker et al. (2018), the combined effect on the liver can be estimated. Rushing et al. (2017) suggests that a similar exercise could be conducted for immune effects of PFCAs.

Gomis et al. (2018) investigated to what extent distribution and elimination kinetics influence toxicological effect thresholds (which are expressed as administered dose). It was observed that converting external doses to internal serum and liver concentrations resulted in reduced variability in the dose-response curves of PFBA, PFHxA, PFOA and HFPO-DA. They concluded that HFPO-DA interacts more strongly with its target (i.e. has a higher toxic potency) than its predecessor PFOA when correcting for differences in toxicokinetics. More precisely, ranking the substances based on toxic potency resulted in HFPO-DA > PFOA > PFHxA > PFBA and HFPO-DA > PFOA = PFHxA = PFBA for internal concentrations in serum and liver respectively. For PFOS and PFBS, no differences in potency were observed based on internal and external doses.

To conclude, HFPO-DA can contribute to the overall combined (additive) toxicity of the related PFASs.

### 6.3.2 Concerns arising from the substance properties

The Guidance on the preparation of an Annex XV dossier for the identification of substances of very high concern, v2.1 (2018)\(^a\) provides general instructions to support the drafting of an Support Document. On the interpretation of the equivalent level of concern (ELoC) as laid down in art 57(f) of REACH, further support has been developed to assist all interested parties in the assessment of substances that may meet this category of concern. In 2015, ECHA, the Commission, and Member States prepared a discussion paper on the identification of substances as SVHC under art. 57(f) with sensitisers as an example\(^\text{24}\). Some years later the Joint Research Centre (JRC) repeated this exercise for the example of neurotoxic and immunotoxic substances, testing to what extent the same assessment elements as for sensitisers could be used on those health concerns\(^\text{25}\). It was concluded by JRC and discussed among Member States, ECHA, and the Commission that this same set of relatively generic assessment elements could be applied to assist the more detailed case-by-case assessment of an equivalent level of concern for these two endpoints. Since then, several substances were included onto the Candidate List on the basis of an Equivalent Level of Concern for Endocrine Disrupting effects on the environment, for Endocrine Disrupting effects on human health and on effects on specific target organs after repeated exposure, i.e. kidney and bone. Assessment of these different cases suggest several additional elements that could be considered, for example in the context of evaluating an equivalent level of concern for the environment like e.g. the possibility to adversely impact future generations and the possibility to impact regions or environmental organisms that are spatially remote from the point of environmental release of the substance.

In the ELoC assessment for HFPO-DA, hazard related arguments and arguments related to environmental abundance and fate play an important role in concluding on the weight of evidence for an equivalent level of concern. This is in line with a recent judgement of the Court (Case C-323/15 P) where ELoC provision "encompasses the possibility of taking into consideration, for the purposes of comparison, material going beyond merely the hazards arising from the intrinsic properties of the substances concerned" (paragraph 34).

#### 6.3.2.1 Concern for an irreversible and increasing presence in the environment

The available information on physicochemical properties, degradation and environmental presence of HFPO-DA gives rise to concern that once the substance enters the environment, its presence

---

\(^a\) https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/23036412/svhc_en.pdf/8faef33c-b46e-4186-8b7c-8cfbecco812


\(^\text{25}\) Identification of Substances of Very High Concern (SVHC) under the 'equivalent level of concern' route (REACH Article 57(f)) – neurotoxicants and immunotoxicants as examples; http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC96572/jrc96572-identification%20svhc%20reach%20article%2057f.pdf
will be irreversible. This concern is supported by the monitoring data on HFPO-DA, detecting this substance far out at sea without any apparent emission source. The information provided in Section 3.1 and summarised in section 6.3.1.1 shows that the degradation potential of HFPO-DA in all environmental compartments can be concluded to be very low or negligible. Based on the available experimental and QSAR information on HFPO-DA, it is concluded that HFPO-DA meets the P and vP-criteria of REACH Annex XIII by far (see also section 6.3.2.8). This finding is also supported by the available information on structurally related substances, and implies that HFPO-DA will remain in the environment for very long times, much longer than many other substances that are identified as exhibiting P or vP properties. This means that HFPO-DA may remain in the environment for such long times that it becomes increasingly difficult to predict possible exposures.

The concern is that as long as HFPO-DA releases to the environment continue, its presence may continue to increase and consequently, slowly increasing environmental concentrations may be unavoidable.

6.3.2.2 Intrinsic substance properties result in irreversible and increasing contamination of surface water, marine water and groundwater

Building on the concern laid down in section 6.3.2.1, the information presented in Sections 1.4 and 3.2 gives rise to the additional concern that once HFPO-DA enters the environment the substance is free to move with the water phase and may thus lead to an irreversible contamination. The fact that today’s environmental distribution observed for Europe developed over a period of only 5 years, with the only REACH-registered import and use site in the Netherlands, adds to the concern that this development may be very rapid.

As long as emissions continue, irrespective of how high these emissions are and in the absence of any significant degradation, concentrations of HFPO-DA will rise and are not expected to decrease over any foreseeable time when emissions cease. Though the overall presence of HFPO-DA is not expected to decrease, local concentrations may, e.g. near an emission point source. There, concentrations of HFPO-DA will go down when emission ceases due to the process of dilution.

The high solubility and low volatility of the ionised form make that HFPO-DA will remain in the water phase. Furthermore, HFPO-DA will not be “filtered” out when water moves through different layers of sediment due to its very low sorption potential to soil, sediment, or organic matter (see Section 3.2.1). Based on today’s knowledge, there may also be no other natural “sink” that could remove HFPO-DA from the water phase and as such, HFPO-DA has the potential to reach remote and pristine areas and eventually will reach ground water and drinking water sources. Cousins et al. (2019) describe that deposition in deep sea may be one mechanism that could remove highly persistent polar substances from water phases that are most bioavailable, providing for some kind of sink, but immediately concludes that this mechanism should not be regarded as real removal, since the substance will still be available and exposure remains possible.

In addition it appears highly difficult to actively remove HFPO-DA from the environment and from drinking water (see also Section 3.2 and the summary in section 6.3.1.7). Even advanced water purification techniques that are in place in Waste Water Treatment Plants and in plants that produce drinking water are mostly not able to remove HFPO-DA, or only to a very limited extent. Information supplied by drinking water companies suggests that it is possible to remove HFPO-DA from the water phase in an effective way, but that it can currently only be done when all other polar compounds are removed also, which leads to significant waste production. Furthermore, the resulting water will have to be remineralised before it will be drinkable. Installing such purification techniques will come with significant costs for society and quality management will require advanced analysis techniques, which all together is not common practice for drinking water companies in Europe. Industry, using FRD-902 in its production processes, indicates that alternative techniques, applying active carbon beds, may be available and can be effective to remove HFPO-DA from their waste water. It remains unclear though to what extent this technique may be implementable at the level of drinking water companies. Other techniques may become available in the future. However, their practical and economical applicability beyond targeted industrial uses are as of yet uncertain. This is of relevance for the production of drinking water,
for the treatment of wastewater and for the remediation of contaminated sites. In light of this information and remaining uncertainties, emissions to the environment are therefore considered irreversible, leading to an irreversible exposure of the environment including secondary poisoning and of man via the environment.

Monitoring data from the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK furthermore point to an unpredictable and uncontrollable spread of HFPO-DA in water and soil. Recent research from the Dutch Enforcement Authority points to significant emission sources due to waste treatment and waste transport activities in the Netherlands, Italy, Belgium and the United Kingdom. Lack of information and communication through the supply chain, including the waste phase of the substance makes these sources uncontrollable at the end-of-pipe, which is of particular concern for HFPO-DA due to its very persistent nature. The uncertainty in spatial distribution of the substance and possible emission sources highly complicates the possibility for taking timely action to remediate contaminated sites before HFPO-DA may find its way to surface or ground water. Therefore, when a human activity causes a release of HFPO-DA, the exposure of the environment and humans via the environment is considered to be impossible to prevent and reverse in practice.

As such, there is high concern that the irreversible presence of HFPO-DA in the environment may lead to worldwide unavoidable contamination of the environment and of drinking water sources.

6.3.2.3 Potential to spread worldwide

The concerns expressed in sections 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2 lead to the concern for a worldwide spread for HFPO-DA. The presence of HFPO-DA at background concentrations in the low ng/L range in the global environment is already being reported and support this concern.

Due to the global water cycle and the fact that the aqueous compartments are all well connected, the very high persistency and the high mobility of HFPO-DA lead to long distance transport processes in the environment. Transport is mainly taking place via river and ocean currents. This is clearly demonstrated by the monitoring data presented, showing the occurrence of HFPO-DA in remote regions of the North Sea and the Baltic and further north in the Norwegian Sea (see Section 3.2.5). However, distribution of the substance may also take place via air, e.g. when emitted as acid fluoride. When HFPO-DA is emitted to air, both modelling and monitoring data indicate that the substance has a high potential for long range transport. Monitoring data furthermore show that long range distribution of the substance from its source may occur via rain water. This process has been described as an important route for HFPO-DA pollution of the environment in the US. The relevance of this contamination process for Europe is unknown as there is no information available on the use of the C3 dimer acid fluoride, or its possible formation e.g. as part of the use of HFPO-DA as processing agent. The currently observed presence of HFPO-DA in the environment, and the clear indication that the substance not only has the potential to migrate long distances in water but also shows this trend in monitoring data, raises concern that (local) emissions of the substance may have a worldwide impact on humans and the environment.

6.3.2.4 Continuous presence in water results in continuous bioavailability

The intrinsic properties of HFPO-DA lead to the concern for a continuous bioavailability worldwide. The limited information available on HFPO-DA in plants, fish, humans, ground water and drinking water, described in section 3.2.5, 3.4 and 3.5, and summarised in section 3.6, support the concern that HFPO-DA can be bioavailable and that exposure may take place via food and drinking water. Because HFPO-DA stays in the water phase, the substance will be continuously bioavailable to organisms that live in water, organisms that drink water, plants that extract water from soil, organisms that eat plants or water living organisms and eventually humans who will be exposed e.g. through food and via drinking water. In the absence of any natural degradation processes (see section 6.3.1.1), HFPO-DA will remain bioavailable over multiple generations and hence can lead to inter-generational effects. A similar concern is also noted for highly soluble and highly polar substances by Reemtsma et al. (2016).

The bioavailability, in combination with the concerns expressed in sections 6.3.2.1, 6.3.2.2 and 6.3.2.3, leads to concern for increasing internal exposures in wildlife and humans over time which can be expected to trigger effects.
6.3.2.5 **HFPO-DA enters the biosphere via several routes**

HFPO-DA enters the biosphere as result of industrial emissions, waste transport and waste treatment activities and to a minor extent through the use of mixtures and articles containing residual amounts of HFPO-DA as impurities remaining from the production process. FRD-903 is on the positive list of Regulation (EU) No 10/2011 on plastic materials and articles intended to come into contact with food. The use of the substance is limited for use as a polymerisation aid in the polymerisation of fluoropolymers that are processed at temperatures at or above 265 °C and are intended for use in repeated use articles. Residual concentrations in polymer formulations are stated by the registrant to be <1 – 50 ppm and in articles <1 ppm. Biota can be exposed to HFPO-DA via the food web (e.g. plants and fish) and via surface water. Exposure via air can be an important route in the vicinity of (industrial) air-emission sources, and possibly when there is emission of the C3 dimer acid fluoride. Airborne emissions are considered a less important route once HFPO-DA has entered the water environment due to the low volatility of the substance, but HFPO-DA as (and its acyl fluoride) in air can lead to detectable concentrations of HFPO-DA in rain water. This can result in detectable concentrations in rain water far away from the source, which contributes to a widespread exposure of biota.

Industrial activities can be an important source of direct exposure of humans. HFPO-DA is detected in workers of a fluorochemical plant in the Netherlands and in citizens living in the proximity of a fluorochemical plant in China. The few studies that are available that report HFPO-DA concentrations in biota or in food and feedstuff note concentrations of 0.27 µg/kg in reedear sunfish and 1.53 µg/kg and 4.7 µg/kg in carp. Concentrations in fish seem to depend on both the water concentration and co-exposure with other PFASs. HFPO-DA is also recently found in home-grown vegetables at concentrations in the low ng/g range in the Netherlands. Over the last year, more and more information is being generated from monitoring studies suggesting that food may act as a source of HFPO-DA to humans. These findings trigger the concern that HFPO-DA is taken up by plants and can enter the food-chain. This is of relevance for example when agricultural soil or surface water is contaminated with HFPO-DA, leading to the contamination of agricultural plants. Given that HFPO-DA is only recently introduced at the EU market (i.e. in 2012 through its ammonium salt FRD-902), it may be expected that with time and continued emissions, HFPO-DA concentrations in food and feedstuff will rise with rising background concentrations of the substance in the environment. Something similar is observed for other short-chain PFASs for which concentrations in biota rose with increasing use from 2002 to 2014, for example, PFSAs as an alternative to PFOS (Lam et al., 2016). Similarly, HFPO-DA concentrations in biota may increase in the future if its use is continued or further increased.

Drinking water may be a third source of HFPO-DA exposure to humans. Monitoring data from several locations in the Netherlands show that drinking water (tap water) may contain HFPO-DA. At present, concentrations of up to 30 ng/L are already found in the Netherlands (see Section 3.2.5). Current data, also from the US, suggest that the presence in drinking water is typically related to industrial activities that involve HFPO-DA or its salts. However, when environmental concentrations of HFPO-DA rise with increasing or continued use, one may expect that also other drinking water locations may become contaminated as a consequence of the very mobile character of the substance and its potential for long range transport. Reemtsma et al. (2016) indicate that this exposure route is different from those typically observed for hydrophobic substances, like PBT or vPvB substances, that adsorb to soil and sediment and accumulate in lipid tissue.

6.3.2.6 **Concern for the observed adverse effects, yet unknown effects, and effects from co-exposure**

Sections 4 and 5 and their summaries in section 6.3.1.9 and 6.3.1.11, respectively, suggest that HFPO-DA has the potential to cause serious effects to human health and wildlife. HFPO-DA does not have a harmonised classification under 1272/2008.

**CLP classifications and identification of T according to Annex XIII of REACH**

During the public consultation, several comments were received from Member States regarding
benchmarking the severity of effects using the criteria for CLP classification and the identification of T according to Annex XIII of REACH. Two Member States noted that the liver effects in the repeated dose studies in rodents, in their view, could warrant STOT RE Cat. 1 classification. One Member State concluded that the available data do not meet classification criteria on any of the endpoints reviewed in the dossier. Furthermore, there were some Member States that requested to reflect upon the CLP criteria in the SVHC dossier to assist in assessing the severity of effects with regard to specific organ toxicity and developmental effects, and their impact on the ELoC assessment.

In previous evaluations on HFPO-DA, the observed adverse health effects in laboratory animals were compared to the CLP criteria as well. In their RMOA on FRD-902, the NL-CA concluded that the effects observed may be borderline to meet the criteria for STOT RE Cat. 2 classification for the liver, and are insufficient for STOT RE effects on the blood. Conversely, the Registrant of FRD-902 self-classified the substance as STOT RE Cat. 2 for the liver and the haematological system. Other than that, in a substance evaluation on FRD-902, it was concluded that the current data for FRD-902 are insufficient to differentiate between no classification for carcinogenicity, a carcinogenicity classification in CLP Cat. 2, and a carcinogenicity classification in CLP Cat. 1B.

It is noted that classification is a relevant but not a decisive element to address a probable serious effect for human health or the environment, and that it is not a sufficient element to argue ELoC according to art. 57(f) of REACH on its own (clarified by the Court in par. 28 of C-323/15P).

Rather than reflecting upon the CLP criteria, a weight of evidence analysis is carried out below to explore whether scientific evidence available for HFPO-DA points to probable serious effects to human health that contribute to ELoC according to art. 57 (f) of REACH.

Weight of evidence approach to evaluate the concern for severe health effects and concern for yet unknown effects

The weight-of–evidence approach to evaluate the concern for severe health effects involves the concern for effects on human health and the concern for effects on the environment.

Human health

Information from mammalian studies suggests that the main target organs upon subchronic and chronic HFPO-DA exposure include the liver, the kidney, the haematologic system, and the immune system. The substance is observed to cross the placenta and to distribute into the foetus, to cause early deliveries, decreased gravid uterine weight, and to result in decreased birth weight and weight decrements in pups. Furthermore, HFPO-DA is also found to induce tumours in the liver, pancreas, and testes in rats upon chronic exposure. At two tumour sites both adenomas and carcinomas were observed, illustrating potential progression of benign tumours into malignant tumours. Further insight in the carcinogenic potential is expected beyond 2022 as a result of the ongoing Substance Evaluation.

The weight-of-evidence for potential effects on human health can be characterised by two types of effects:

1. Observed adverse effects: concern for serious effects observed in the available studies that can be assessed based on the available data with (high) probability for human health. This applies to the effects observed for the liver, the kidney, the haematological system, the immune system, and for developmental effects.

2. Yet unknown effects: there is concern for possible effects that may only become apparent after life-long exposure that are normally not tested for in standard toxicity tests. This concern is inherent to the high persistency of the substance and its continuous bioavailability.

Due to their occurrence at low doses and type of adverse effects, the effects observed in the liver (i.e. multifocal necrosis, >1000% increase of liver enzymes), for which the mode of action is still

---

https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/a69d536b-4274-ff51-800a-65e6af17d0fa
unclear, are considered to contribute highly to the overall concern for severity of observed adverse effects. The effects on spleen weight and the A/G ratio indicate a possible concern for immune toxicity and thereby contribute to the overall concern for observed adverse effects, as do the effects on the kidney and the blood. These effects have an intermediate contribution to the overall concern for observed adverse effects, since these effects either occur at higher doses (kidney- and haematological effects) or occur at low doses but have less supportive information available (immunological effects).

Further supporting the concern for these observed adverse effects is the notion that the high persistency, mobility and bioavailability of HFPO-DA leads to continuous exposure (see also sections 6.3.2.1 - 6.3.2.4). When this continuous exposure reaches levels that could trigger effects, these effects could be considered irreversible, even if these effects would be reversible in standard toxicity tests upon removal of exposure. This is relevant for the liver-, kidney-, and haematological effects observed, and possibly also for the immune effects. These observed adverse effects may already be relevant upon short-term exposure (i.e. immune, haematological, liver and kidney effects).

The observed effects for reproduction and development, considered indicative of delayed and impaired growth, are included as a concern for possible adverse effect on human health. The effects in rats, but not in mice, possibly relate to maternal toxicity. The fact that the top-dose used in the reproduction/developmental screening study in mice is relatively low and does not exert sufficient toxicity in the parental animals, raises concern that the results of this study do not reflect HFPO-DA its full potential for the endpoints fertility and development in mice.27

In addition to the above, the tumours observed in the rodent chronic/carcinogenicity study are brought into the equivalent level of concern assessment as supportive information. Based on this information, HFPO-DA could be a possible human carcinogen. The undergoing Substance Evaluation requests more information to elucidate this. Regarding the carcinogenic effects, more information may become available in upcoming years. These new insights may or may not lead to more stringent health guidance values. Though this may be inherent to hazard assessment in general, comparison to other PFASs strengthens concern for these effects. E.g. PFOA is a suspected human carcinogen (Carc. cat. 2) according to RAC (ECHA, 2011), which further supports concern for this specific endpoint.

The high persistency, mobility and bioavailability of HFPO-DA leads to continuous exposure (see also sections 6.3.2.1 - 6.3.2.4), for which ceasing of emissions will not necessarily lead to a direct reduction of exposure concentrations. When this continuous exposure reaches levels that could trigger effects, these effects could be considered irreversible, even if these effects would be reversible in standard toxicity tests upon removal of exposure. This further strengthen the concern for observed adverse effects.

In addition to the observed adverse effects, there is potential for yet unknown effects that may only become apparent over decades. These as of yet unknown effects may not be observed in standard toxicity tests or may only develop as a consequence of life long human exposure. Since the concern is that HFPO-DA, once in the environment can be hardly removed and hence will be constantly bioavailable, the potential for yet unknown effects to arise over the years is of concern and contributes to the weight-of-evidence for probable serious effects on human health.

**Environment**

Direct ecotoxicity of HFPO-DA to aquatic species, such as algae, daphnids and fish, is generally low (Smit, 2017, Rutgers et al., 2019), no data for direct ecotoxicity to terrestrial species (e.g. earthworms, plants) are available. For the environment, direct toxicity of HFPO-DA to aquatic and terrestrial species is not considered to contribute significantly to the overall equivalent level of concern assessment for HFPO-DA. However, birds and mammals are more sensitive to HFPO-DA and the toxicity towards birds and mammals is relevant for wildlife. This concern results from the
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27According to the latest version of OECD TG 421, “the highest dose level should be chosen with the aim to induce toxicity but not death or severe suffering” and “a descending sequence of dose levels should be selected with a view to demonstrating any dosage related response and a NOAEL at the lowest dose level.”

fact that often a particular food item (such as terrestrial plants or fish) is the sole energy source for a specific mammalian or avian species. When this food item is rich in HFPO-DA this may lead to a high HFPO-DA intake. Relatively stringent safety levels are derived for secondary poisoning of herbivores and fish-eating wildlife and their predators based on observed effects on growth in the F1 in mice. In the present case of secondary poisoning, these adverse effects for offspring are considered relevant at the population level, regardless whether this is caused by maternal toxicity or not.

Comparison to the available information on the presence of HFPO-DA in the environment from monitoring data suggests that maximum concentrations in fish and terrestrial plants (leaf vegetables) near known emission sources are in the same order of magnitude as the safety levels derived for herbivorous and fish-eating wildlife (see sections 3.4 and 3.5). Wildlife is considered as a protection goal for HFPO-DA as it is for PBT/vPvB substances. It is noted that there is a significant difference between the level of secondary poisoning concern resulting from a risk assessment (part of the CSR), and the secondary poisoning concern for PBT/vPvB substances (at an SVHC level).

The safety levels derived, therefore give rise to concern for HFPO-DA exposure to wildlife, which is currently likely in the vicinity of the manufacturing sites, and lead to consider secondary poisoning as a relevant effect that adds to the overall concern of the equivalent level of concern assessment.

In addition, there is a concern for as of yet unknown effects of HFPO-DA on the environment that may not be observed in standard toxicity tests or may only develop after life-long exposure. This concern originates from the fact that HFPO-DA will remain in the environment for so long that there is a high chance that effects on the environment that are not known today may be discovered in upcoming years, which is similar to what is described in the context of unknown effects for human health.

Comparison to other PFASs

The concern for severe effects for HFPO-DA is further supported when compared to existing concerns for other PFASs. Based on available subacute and subchronic oral toxicity studies in rodents, relative potency factors were derived as a function of the external exposure ranking the toxicity as PFOA > PFTeDA > HFPO-DA > PFHxA > PFHxDA > PFBS. Ranking different PFAS substances based on toxic potency for internal concentrations in serum and liver resulted in HFPO-DA > PFOA > PFHxA > PFBA and HFPO-DA > PFOA ≈ PFHxA ≈ PFBA, respectively. Hence, it is concluded that HFPO-DA has a higher internal toxic potency than PFOA.

Possibility to remedy effects

Following the concerns expressed in section 6.3.2.1 - 6.3.2.5, exposures may occur with a delay, as measured from the moment of emission, which complicates management or prevention of effects. Also, ceasing emissions may not reduce exposures within any foreseeable time and decontamination of the environment may not be possible in practice. Decontamination of drinking water may be an option, but may not sufficiently reduce exposure for humans and is not effective to reduce wildlife exposures. Moreover, such remediation techniques may come with high societal costs. Consequently, once effects become apparent it may not be possible anymore to remedy these.

Concern related to co-exposure

The concerns brought forward in sections 6.3.2.1 - 6.3.2.5 furthermore lead to a concern for co-exposure with other contaminants with similar health effects. One possible large group of contaminants with roughly similar health effects (with different potencies) are other PFASs. The different substances in this group typically are metabolised or degrade to highly persistent substances, of which some may also be mobile. This raises concern for adverse health effects upon cumulative exposure to several PFASs, to which HFPO-DA may contribute. Co-exposure may last for a very long time.
Summary of the overall assessment of possible serious effects on human health and the environment

The available information on the observed adverse effects on the liver, the kidney, the haematologic system, and the immune system and development as it stands today, together are already considered probable serious for human health. The adverse effects on growth of the F1 generation suggest that HFPO-DA has probable serious effects on wildlife as well. The carcinogenic effects in rats are considered supportive for the overall concern. Besides that, co-existence of HFPO-DA with other PFASs, which are persistent and have similar toxicological properties, is supportive to the concern.

Based on the information available, it is concluded that HFPO-DA has probable serious effects on human health and the environment. These aspects contribute to the concern for adverse effects in the context of the assessment of an equivalent level of concern.

6.3.2.7 Derivation of limit values is highly uncertain

Some limit values are derived for HFPO-DA (see section 6.3.1.10). These limit values take account of various uncertainties that are apparent. Although it may be possible to derive safe levels, the concerns expressed in sections 6.3.2.1 - 6.3.2.6 together mean that on the basis of the current data, derivation of safe exposure levels is very difficult.

6.3.2.8 Comparison of above concerns to concerns of PBT/vPvB substances

The ECHA Guidance for PBT/vPvB assessment (Chapter R.11) (ECHA (2017a) states:

“Experience with PBT/vPvB substances has shown that they can give rise to specific concerns that may arise due to their potential to accumulate in parts of the environment and

- that the effects of such accumulation are unpredictable in the long-term;
- such accumulation is in practice difficult to reverse as cessation of emission will not necessarily result in a reduction in substance concentration."

“Furthermore, PBT or vPvB substances may have the potential to contaminate remote areas that should be protected from further contamination by hazardous substances resulting from human activity because the intrinsic value of pristine environments should be protected” (ECHA Guidance R.11).

The concerns expressed in sections 6.3.2.1 - 6.3.2.7 are the same as these three key concerns for PBT/vPvB substances. Cousins et al. (2019) reflect on this type of concern in a more general manner for compounds that are highly persistent and poorly adsorb to organic matter and sediments. Furthermore, Section 4.0.1 of REACH Annex I explains, that a hazard assessment addressing all the long-term effects and the estimation of the long-term exposure of humans and the environment cannot be carried out with sufficient reliability for PBT/vPvB-substances. With respect to long-term exposure estimations this is also the case for HFPO-DA, because of the very high persistency of HFPO-DA, the adverse effects observed and the uncertainty of effects arising at longer time scales.

As has already been indicated in section 6.3.2.1, HFPO-DA is much more persistent than the persistency criteria laid down in Annex XIII of 1907/2006 for P and vP stipulate. Therefore, it can be expected that, at the same emission rate, the amount of HFPO-DA present in the environment will increase faster and will reach a higher level compared to most persistent or very persistent substances identified so far. In addition, after cessation of emissions, HFPO-DA will remain in the environment much longer than these substances. Cousins et al. (2019) used model calculations to show the importance of persistency on environmental concentrations. The results indicated that concentrations of very persistent chemicals (e.g. with a degradation half-life in the order of

\[\text{The results of Cousins et al. (2019) indicate that an increase in degradation half-life by a factor of 1000 (from 2d to 2000 d) leads to an increase in time to steady-state environmental concentration by a factor of 600-880 (from 20 d to 33-48.5 years).}\]
2000 days) may continue to increase for certain time even after the emissions start to reduce. After the stop of emissions, the decreasing concentrations show a long tail that extends for many years.

With regard to the mobile character of HFPO-DA, comparison to the B or vB of the PBT/vPvB criteria is less straightforward. Persistent substances, regardless whether mobile or bioaccumulative, would seem to share the same concern for the development of high internal concentrations which trigger effects. The contributing factors defining the internal concentrations include persistence, bioaccumulation potential, bioavailability, and time. Due to the high persistence of HFPO-DA compared to most PBT/vPvB substances and the yet unknown (or for the purpose of this generic consideration low) bioaccumulation potential, the difference between environmental and internal concentration of HFPO-DA can be expected to be relatively low compared to PBT/vPvB substances. B/vB properties characterise the high potential of a substance to develop increased internal concentrations compared to external concentrations leading, in combination with persistency, to unpredictable, irreversible internal concentrations. Emissions of HFPO-DA, being a mobile and highly persistent substance, build continuous, irreversible external concentrations that lead to continuous, increasing exposures of HFPO-DA, which is fully bioavailable (e.g. in water) to wildlife and man via environment. This in turn may lead to similar internal exposure.

In summary, both types of substances (i.e., highly persistent and bioavailable substances and PBT/vPvB substances) lead to unpredictable and uncontrollable internal exposures of the organism. As expressed in section 6.3.2.2, the fact that there is no known natural sink to remove HFPO-DA from the water phase implies that all the mass of HFPO-DA that gets emitted will be bioavailable. It is noted that due to the properties of HFPO-DA a higher proportion of the emitted substance is likely to be bioavailable compared to PBT/vPvB substances which are more readily adsorbed to soil, sediment and suspended matter. This may lead to a higher exposure potential and internal concentrations for HFPO-DA than would be expected based on its half-life and BCF only.

Several historical PBT/vPvB cases indicate that irreversible or poorly reversible internal exposures to a substance can potentially lead to toxic effects that are not already known.

Regarding vPvB substances, ECHA guidance (ECHA 2017a) states:

“In the case of vPvB substances, there is concern that even if no toxicity is demonstrated in laboratory testing, long-term effects might be possible since high but unpredictable levels may be reached in man or the environment over extended time periods”

Considering the properties of HFPO-DA in comparison with PBT/vPvB substances as discussed above, the same concern for toxicity is relevant for HFPO-DA (as already expressed in section 6.3.2.6).

### 6.3.3 Overall concern and assessment of the level of concern

HFPO-DA is considered to be of equivalent level of concern to the very high concern for substances meeting the criteria laid down in art. 57(a) – (e) according to art. 57(f) of 1907/2006 because of the overall concern arising from the concern elements described in section 6.3.2. The elements which are used in this case for assessing the level of concern and description of how HFPO-DA compares to those elements are listed in Table 35.

HFPO-DA has due to its persistence, mobility, potential for long-range transport, observed effects to human health and environment, and accumulation in plants, a very high potential to cause effects in wildlife and in man via environment. The very high persistence together with low adsorption potential (and therefore difficulty for end-of-pipe treatment) and mobility imply a high potential for increasing pollution stock and irreversible, fully bioavailable, increasing exposures of both wildlife and man via environment as long as emissions continue. These mean a high potential for irreversible effects once effect levels have been reached and an increasing seriousness of effects while exposures keep increasing. The substance has due to its intrinsic properties also high
potential to cause widespread exposures and due to the difficulty of decontamination of drinking water resources as well as the large variety of exposure routes for food intake there are no possibilities to avoid the continuous and increasing exposure in any human populations. Neither will any wildlife populations be protected from the whole released mass of the substance. From this follows that both environment and humans are susceptible to impairment at large.

Table 35: Overview of the qualitative components relevant for assessing the level of concern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Irreversibility of the exposure of wildlife and man via environment</strong></th>
<th>HFPO-DA has high potential to cause irreversible exposures. The degradation potential of HFPO-DA in all environmental compartments can be concluded to be very low or negligible. Its’ high persistency implies that HFPO-DA will remain in the environment for much longer times than most other substances that are identified as exhibiting P or vP properties. HFPO-DA by far exceeds the criteria for P and vP as laid down in Annex XIII of 1907/2006. Exposures are not expected to decrease upon cessation of releases because of the high persistence of the substance. In addition, the high potential to cause long-term exposures causes a difficulty to quantify exposures with sufficient certainty.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential for rapid and wide geographic scale contamination</strong></td>
<td>Due to the global water cycle and the fact that the aqueous compartments are all well connected, the high persistency and the high mobility of HFPO-DA lead to long distance transport processes in the environment. HFPO-DA has already been found at a diversity of locations in surface water, sea water, ground water and drinking water despite a limited number of known releasing sites. The European spread of HFPO-DA observed from monitoring data may have occurred over a period of only 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential to continuous increase of exposures</strong></td>
<td>HFPO-DA has a very high potential to cause an increasing pollution stock due to the combination of high persistence and difficulty of using end-of-pipe emission reduction measures (as a result of low adsorption potential, negligible degradation potential and the water solubility). Furthermore, as a mobile substance, there are no local or intermittent sinks for the pollution stock and therefore the substance has high potential to cause continuous increase of exposure of wildlife. Additionally, due to the inefficiency of decontamination and remediation techniques for this substance, it has a high potential to cause continuously increasing exposure of humans via environment. It is very difficult to remove HFPO-DA from water. Adsorption of HFPO-DA to soil, sediment and organic matter is very poor. Available techniques suggest that remediation of HFPO-DA containing water comes with high costs for society and the generation of serious amounts of waste from the water purification process. Removing HFPO-DA from the water compartment of the environment is considered impossible in practice due to the high mobility of the substance and the presence of diffuse emission sources as suggested by monitoring data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential for causing serious effects although those would not be observed in standard tests (including secondary poisoning)</strong></td>
<td>Because HFPO-DA stays in the water phase, the whole released mass of the substance will be continuously bioavailable to organisms that live in water, organisms that drink water, plants that extract water from soil, animals that drink water and eat plants or water living organisms and...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
humans who will be exposed e.g. through food and via drinking water. This in combination with the high potential to cause continuously increasing pollution stock (see above) trigger high potential for increased internal exposures and thereby a high likelihood of reaching levels which would cause effects and, in progress of time, serious effects even for endpoints where the substance would show a low or moderate intrinsic toxicity based on standard tests, or no effects at all. This mechanism also applies to secondary poisoning. Wildlife feeding on plants and fish which accumulate HFPO-DA may be susceptible to reaching effect levels.

Potential for causing serious effects on human health (known and unknown), and the environment (including the potential for irreversible effects)

For human health, the concern relates to observed effects in rodents for the liver, the kidney, the haematological system, the immune system and for development. In addition to these, there are effects observed in the available studies that are brought into the equivalent level of concern assessment as supportive information. This relates to the endpoint carcinogenicity. Due to the positive response in a rodent carcinogenicity study (i.e. pancreatic-, liver- and testis tumours), HFPO-DA could be a possible human carcinogen. This concern is topic of further investigation in the Substance Evaluation on FRD-902.

As a consequence of the high persistence and chronic background concentrations in the environment, continuous exposure may lead to concentration levels that could trigger effects and these effects could be considered irreversible, even if these adverse effects are normally reversible in standard toxicity studies upon the removal of exposure. This adds to the concern for the severity of the effects.

For the environment, the concern relates to secondary poisoning of wildlife based on effects on growth observed in the F1 of mice. Current information suggests that secondary poisoning is particularly relevant for herbivore and fish-eating wildlife.

Delay of effects

The main effects on human health brought forward to support the equivalent level of concern may already be relevant upon short-term exposure (i.e. immune effects, haematological effects, liver effects, kidney effects). The highly mobile character of HFPO-DA together with its high persistence cause that exposures may occur with a delay, as measured from the moment of emission. It can be argued for HFPO-DA it is equally difficult to manage or prevent effects when exposure could occur with a delay, as it is difficult to manage or prevent effects that could occur after a short-time exposure.

HFPO-DA is expected to contribute to cumulative exposure with several other PFASs. Co-exposure may eventually occur and may last for a very long time as the natural degradation processes for these substances are slow or negligible.

Potential to cause combined effects (co-exposure)

The irreversibility and high potential for increasing exposures increases the potential of HFPO-DA to cause yet unknown health effects. This uncertainty is of concern for both human health and the environment. With time, effects may be discovered that may lead to more stringent safety levels for HFPO-DA. The derivation of safe exposure levels may therefore be possible in principle but is considered not to be of sufficient reliability.

Uncertainties in deriving safe concentration limits

Possibility to remedy effects

Reversing effects may hardly be possible due to the difficulty to decrease exposure. Consequently, for this substance prevention of emission is preferred over remediating the eventual effect. Same applies, e.g., for CMRs of Cat 1, where
the effects on humans are generally so serious and cannot normally be reversed such that effects have to be prevented rather than remedied (C-323/15P paragraph 37). The same applies for substances fulfilling PBT/vPvB criteria.

Monitoring data already provide evidence that HFPO-DA is present in fish, plants and humans at some locations despite of the short emission history of the substance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertainties in quantifying exposures with sufficient certainty</th>
<th>Due to its high persistency and long-range transport potential a quantification of future exposures of HFPO-DA encompasses high uncertainties. There are no such exposure tools available which would with acceptable reliability predict exposures which would occur after decades of pile up and distribution of the substance. Also development of such estimation tools would take an unreasonable long time considering that the exposures are irreversible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential to impair humans and the environment at large</td>
<td>HFPO-DA has a very high potential to impair humans and the environment at large due to the combination of high potential of HFPO-DA to wide geographic scale contamination (as described above) and the high potential for causing serious effects although those would not be observed in standard tests (as described above). There are no natural barriers or environmental sinks that may reduce exposure, neither is it feasible to establish man-made barriers. Therefore the concern is that the mobility of HFPO-DA, in combination with its high persistence and possible adverse effects may eventually give rise to an uncontrollable and unpredictable risk for human health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-generational effects</td>
<td>HFPO-DA shows negligible or very slow degradation under environmentally relevant conditions and hence will remain in the environment for long periods of time, possibly stretching across generations. As such, effects of current emissions may be observed or only become apparent in next generations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Societal concern                                            | Art. 7.3 of the Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC) stipulates that "Member States shall ensure the necessary protection for the bodies of water identified with the aim of avoiding deterioration in their quality of water to reduce the level of purification treatment required in the production of drinking water."

The European drinking water association EurEau and several drinking water companies have indicated that they already detect HFPO-DA in some of their drinking water sources and that the decontamination can only be achieved against high societal costs if at all.

The latter express that there is societal concern for the possible presence of HFPO-DA in drinking water that requires immediate action.

Because of the high persistency and mobility, exposure will occur far away from the point of release. Effects may therefore come with a delay and will be difficult to manage in a timely manner.
### 6.3.4 Conclusion on the hazard properties and equivalent level of concern assessment

2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid, its salts and its acyl halides (covering any of their individual isomers and combinations thereof), further denoted as HFPO-DA, are identified as substances of very high concern in accordance with Article 57(f) of Regulation (EC) 1907/2006 (REACH) because in water under environmental conditions these substances exist in the form of 2,3,3,3-tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoate, for which there is scientific evidence of probable serious effects to the environment and human health which give rise to an equivalent level of concern to those of other substances listed in points (a) to (e) of Article 57 of REACH.

Several concerns are caused by the intrinsic properties of HFPO-DA. Elements of concern are triggered by individual intrinsic properties or by different combinations of the properties. Overall, HFPO-DA has a very high potential to cause effects in wildlife and in humans exposed via environment, due to its persistence, mobility, potential for long-range transport, observed adverse effects that may be relevant for human health and the environment (at least the following probable effects for human health: effects on the liver, the kidney, the haematological and immune systems and effects on development, and the following effects for the environment: population relevant effects on birds and mammals) and exposure via plants and fish. The very high persistence together with low adsorption potential and mobility imply a very high potential for increasing pollution stock in the environment and for irreversible and increasing exposures of both wildlife and humans exposed via the environment. Furthermore, the low adsorption potential and high water solubility leads to difficulty in removing HFPO-DA using end-of-pipe treatment and means that HFPO-DA is fully bioavailable for uptake via water. Together, these elements of concern lead to a very high potential for irreversible effects once effect levels have been reached, as well as an increasing seriousness of effects while exposures keep increasing.

Due to its intrinsic properties the substance also has a very high potential to cause widespread exposures. It is difficult to decontaminate drinking water resources and there is a large variety of exposure routes for intake via food. Therefore, continuous and increasing exposure in human populations cannot be avoided. Similarly, wildlife populations cannot be protected from the total quantity of the substance released. It follows that both environment and humans are susceptible to adverse effects on a global scale. In summary, the elements above provide scientific evidence of serious effects that are probable for human health and the environment.

The level of concern is considered very high due to the combination of:

- the high potential for irreversible exposure due to very high persistence and in the case of human exposures via environment - difficulty to decontaminate drinking water,
- the high potential for increasing contamination and increasing, fully bioavailable exposures as the intrinsic properties cause a difficulty to remove the substance after release,
- the high potential for rapid and wide geographic scale contamination,
- the high potential for causing serious effects even though those would not be observed in standard tests,
- the observed effects in experimental toxicity studies are of such nature that in combination with the above aspects, they lead to a high potential for serious effects on humans and the environment on a global scale,
- potential for inter-generational effects,
- high societal concerns.

The main target organs identified in rodent studies include the liver, the kidney, the haematologic system, and the immune system. The substance is furthermore observed to cross the placenta and to distribute into the foetus, to cause early deliveries, decreased gravid uterine weight, and to result in decreased birth weight in pups. The carcinogenic effects observed in rats are included
as supportive information, although the carcinogenic potential of the substance is under investigation. In addition, secondary poisoning is of concern for wildlife. The irreversibility of adverse effects that are normally considered as reversible as a consequence of continuous exposure adds to the concern. Furthermore, it may be difficult in practice to manage exposures due to the high mobility of HFPO-DA and the fact that exposures may take place at a different location than where releases occurred and at a different moment in time. The high persistence and high mobility of HFPO-DA together furthermore lead to a concern for co-exposure with other contaminants with similar health effects. Co-exposure may eventually occur and may last for a very long time, because natural degradation processes for these substances are slow or negligible. This is brought into the weight-of-evidence as supportive information.

Monitoring data show HFPO-DA in surface water, sea water, ground water and drinking water, at locations with and without apparent emission sources in the vicinity. HFPO-DA is also found in fish, plants and humans close to known emission sites. This indicates that HFPO-DA can be bioavailable, that it is probable that exposure may occur through the food chain and via drinking water and that this is already taking place at specific locations.

Limitations of the available remediation techniques raise a concern that the removal of HFPO-DA from drinking water may only be possible with high societal costs. Remediation of environmental pollution may be practically impossible due to HFPO-DAs' high solubility in water, its low adsorption potential and its high mobility. Remediation is also difficult because HFPO-DA will quickly diffuse from contaminated sites.

None of these observations may be of equivalent level of concern in isolation, but in a weight-of-evidence consideration, the above arguments demonstrate that there is scientific evidence of probable serious adverse effects of these substances to the environment and humans, which gives rise to an equivalent level of concern to those of other substances listed in points (a) to (e) of Article 57 of the REACH Regulation.
### Annex I – OECD LRTP Tool calculation outcomes

#### OECD Pov & LRTP Screening Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HFPO-DA</th>
<th>132</th>
<th>5728</th>
<th>1.51E+01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Persistence</td>
<td>POV (days)</td>
<td>Transport Potential</td>
<td>CTD (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFPO-DA</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>5728</td>
<td>1.51E+01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partition Coefficients:**
- Half Lives (hours):
  - Air: 494
  - Water: 1440
  - Soil: 4300

#### Partition Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
<th>Depth (m)</th>
<th>Area (m²)</th>
<th>Density (kg/m³)</th>
<th>Z (mol/Pa.m³)</th>
<th>Equilibrium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Air</td>
<td>3.06E+18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>4.03E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Water</td>
<td>3.62E+16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.62E+14</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.90E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Soil</td>
<td>6.47E+15</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>8.08E+13</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1.01E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Degradation Reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D (mol/Pa.h)</th>
<th>k (h⁻¹)</th>
<th>t¹/² (h)</th>
<th>Eair Rate (mol/h)</th>
<th>Ewater Rate (mol/h)</th>
<th>Esoil Rate (mol/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,5) Air</td>
<td>1.73E+12</td>
<td>1.40E-03</td>
<td>4.94E+02</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,5) Water</td>
<td>5.06E+12</td>
<td>4.81E-04</td>
<td>1.44E+03</td>
<td>43.57</td>
<td>84.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,5) Soil</td>
<td>2.41E+09</td>
<td>1.60E-04</td>
<td>4.32E+03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Physical Removal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
<th>Vol Fraction</th>
<th>Fraction OC</th>
<th>Density (kg/m³)</th>
<th>Z (mol/Pa.m³)</th>
<th>Comp. Partitioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,1) Air</td>
<td>3.06E+18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>4.03E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,2) Water</td>
<td>3.62E+16</td>
<td>0.9999995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.90E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,3) Soil</td>
<td>6.47E+15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.90E-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Mass balance check

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
<th>Vol Fraction</th>
<th>Fraction OC</th>
<th>Density (kg/m³)</th>
<th>Z (mol/Pa.m³)</th>
<th>Comp. Partitioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,2) Total air-water</td>
<td>1.84E+12</td>
<td>1.40E-03</td>
<td>4.64E+02</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,3) Total air-soil</td>
<td>6.22E+06</td>
<td>1.27E-06</td>
<td>3.44E+04</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3) Total soil-water</td>
<td>1.67E+09</td>
<td>1.12E-04</td>
<td>6.21E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Inter-compartment Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
<th>Vol Fraction</th>
<th>Fraction OC</th>
<th>Density (kg/m³)</th>
<th>Z (mol/Pa.m³)</th>
<th>Comp. Partitioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,2) Air-water diffusion</td>
<td>1.73E+12</td>
<td>1.40E-03</td>
<td>4.64E+02</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,2) Air-water dry deposition</td>
<td>3.06E+09</td>
<td>2.94E-09</td>
<td>2.36E+06</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,2) Air-water rain dissolution</td>
<td>5.06E+12</td>
<td>4.81E-04</td>
<td>1.44E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1,2) Air-water wet deposition</td>
<td>2.41E+09</td>
<td>1.60E-04</td>
<td>4.32E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3) Soil-water diffusion</td>
<td>6.47E+15</td>
<td>1.87E-03</td>
<td>3.71E+04</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3) Soil-water dry deposition</td>
<td>1.67E+09</td>
<td>1.12E-04</td>
<td>6.21E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3) Soil-water rain dissolution</td>
<td>1.67E+09</td>
<td>1.12E-04</td>
<td>6.21E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,3) Soil-water wet deposition</td>
<td>1.67E+09</td>
<td>1.12E-04</td>
<td>6.21E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,1) Soil-air diffusion</td>
<td>1.73E+12</td>
<td>1.40E-03</td>
<td>4.64E+02</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,1) Soil-air dry deposition</td>
<td>3.06E+09</td>
<td>2.94E-09</td>
<td>2.36E+06</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,1) Soil-air rain dissolution</td>
<td>5.06E+12</td>
<td>4.81E-04</td>
<td>1.44E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,1) Soil-air wet deposition</td>
<td>2.41E+09</td>
<td>1.60E-04</td>
<td>4.32E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,2) Soil-water diffusion</td>
<td>6.47E+15</td>
<td>1.87E-03</td>
<td>3.71E+04</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,2) Soil-water dry deposition</td>
<td>1.67E+09</td>
<td>1.12E-04</td>
<td>6.21E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,2) Soil-water rain dissolution</td>
<td>1.67E+09</td>
<td>1.12E-04</td>
<td>6.21E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3,2) Soil-water wet deposition</td>
<td>1.67E+09</td>
<td>1.12E-04</td>
<td>6.21E+03</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Surface Transfer Efficiency (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume (m³)</th>
<th>Vol Fraction</th>
<th>Fraction OC</th>
<th>Density (kg/m³)</th>
<th>Z (mol/Pa.m³)</th>
<th>Comp. Partitioning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Air</td>
<td>3.06E+18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>4.03E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Water</td>
<td>3.62E+16</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3.62E+14</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2.90E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Soil</td>
<td>6.47E+15</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>8.08E+13</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1.01E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Half Lives (hours):
- Air: 494
- Water: 1440
- Soil: 4300
Annex II - Additional information on read across approach

In general, the read-across approach can be applied if substances whose physicochemical and/or toxicological and/or ecotoxicological properties are likely to be similar or follow a regular pattern as a result of structural similarity. Those substances may be considered as a group or a category of substances. According to ECHA’s practical guide 6 “How to report readacross and categories” similarities may be due to a common functional group, common precursor or breakdown products, constant pattern in changing potency or common constituents or chemical class.

Structural similarities of HFPO-DA to PFCAs

The difference between HFPO-DA and PFCAs is the ether bond in the perfluoro chain. The ether bond does not change the steric conformation of the (perfluorocarbon)-chain as compared to (perfluoro)alkyl carboxylic acids. The length of the C-O bond in the ether group is not very different from the length of the C-C bond in an (perfluoroo)alkyl chain. Also the angle of the C-O-C bond (~120 degrees) is close to the C-C-C bond in an alkyl chain of 109 degrees. The backbone of HFPO-DA consists of a perfluoropropylene group, ether bond and a perfluoro acetic acid group, and will therefore have approximately the same length as linear PFHxA and in structure resemble the branched form of PFHpA (2m-PFHpA). Linear PFHxA, branched 2m-PFHpA and HFPO-DA are depicted in structure optimized 3D representation (ACDLabs, ChemSketch) to show the similar steric conformations and similar chain length.

![PFHxA](image1.png)  ![2m-PFHpA](image2.png)  ![HFPO-DA](image3.png)

The difference is that HFPO-DA and 2m-PFHpA have an additional trifluoromethyl-substituent in the position next to the carboxylic acid group, where PfHxA only has a fluoro atom. PFHxA and m-PFHpA have a fluorinated carbon atom in the third position, where HFPO-DA has an oxygen of the ether in the third position.

The trifluoromethyl group, which adds branching to the alkyl-chain backbone, is considered to lead to higher persistence when considering non-fluorinated hydrocarbons. For the perfluorinated hydrocarbons branching will probably not change the already very high persistence of the unbranched perfluoro acid like PFHxA.

Perfluorinated carboxylic acids (PFCAs) have a highly similar chemical structure: a perfluorinated carbon chain and a carboxylic acid group. They differ only in the number of CF₂-groups whereas all other fragments are the same within the group. As a result of comparing the experimental and estimated data of the PFCAs, it can be concluded that with increasing chain length water solubility decreases and the sorption potential increases (see Table A). It can be stated with sufficient reliability that the behaviour of the PFCAs follows a regular pattern.

Dissociation of C8-14-PFCAs and its salts in aqueous media

Under environmental conditions in aqueous media the free perfluorinated carboxylic acids stay in equilibrium with their conjugate bases, the perfluorinated carboxylates. The fraction of each species depends on the acid dissociation constant (pKa) and the pH of the environmental compartment. Salts of PFCAs and HFPO-DA, which are sometimes used in laboratory experiments, will be in equilibrium with the corresponding acid in aqueous phases as well. Currently used techniques for analysis and quantification of PFCAs in i.e. environmental samples are not able to distinguish between both of the species. Therefore, reported concentrations always include the acids as well as the bases. If reported concentrations are used for the
determination of bioaccumulation factors or for experiments determining the persistency, aqueous phase concentrations include both acid and base. Experimental determination of pKa is difficult for PFCAs, i.e. because of the surface active properties. Calculated values should be taken with care, because for most of the models it is unclear whether PFCAs are within their applicability domain. For assessing the intrinsic properties of HFPO-DA within this dossier the exact knowledge of the fraction of each species is not required, because both of the species will be available independently from the starting conditions. Physicochemical properties and partition coefficients of HFPO-DA and C4 to C8-PFCAs are presented in the table below. The estimates have to be considered as rough indications because of the high degree of dissociation of the substances in water. It can be concluded that HFPO-DA has estimated properties that are comparable to the C4 to C8-PFCAs.
### Table A: Basic substance information and physical chemical properties relevant to justify grouping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>HFPO-DA</th>
<th>PFBA</th>
<th>PFPeA</th>
<th>PFHxA</th>
<th>PFHpA</th>
<th>PFOA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IUPAC Name</td>
<td>2,3,3,3-Tetrafluoro-2-(heptafluoropropoxy)propanoic acid</td>
<td>Butanoic acid, heptafluoro-</td>
<td>Pentanoic acid, nonafluoro-</td>
<td>Hexanoic acid, undecafluoro-</td>
<td>Heptanoic acid, tridecafluoro-</td>
<td>Octanoic acid, pentadecafluoro-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Structure</td>
<td>CF₃(CF₂)₂O CF₃COOH</td>
<td>CF₃(CF₂)₂-COOH</td>
<td>CF₃(CF₂)₃-COOH</td>
<td>CF₃(CF₂)₄-COOH</td>
<td>CF₃(CF₂)₅-COOH</td>
<td>CF₃(CF₂)₆-COOH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS No</td>
<td>13252-13-6</td>
<td>375-22-4</td>
<td>2706-90-3</td>
<td>307-24-4</td>
<td>375-85-9</td>
<td>335-67-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Weight g/mol</td>
<td>330.06</td>
<td>214.04</td>
<td>264.05</td>
<td>314.05</td>
<td>364.06</td>
<td>414.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partitioning Coefficient log ( K_{ow} )</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log ( K_{oa} )</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log ( K_{aw} )</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissociation constant pKa</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
<td>-4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log ( K_{oc} )</td>
<td>2.48/1.92</td>
<td>1.81/1.34</td>
<td>2.46/1.71</td>
<td>3.12/2.08</td>
<td>3.77/2.45</td>
<td>4.42/2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water solubility</td>
<td>17/27</td>
<td>316/1373</td>
<td>17/197</td>
<td>0.85/27</td>
<td>0.042/3.6</td>
<td>0.0020/0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vapour pressure</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boiling point</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All data are estimated by EpiSuite v 4.11, except the pKa, which was estimated by MarvinSketch v16.10.24. For log \( K_{oc} \) and solubility two values are estimated by EpiSuite. The first value denotes the fragment method, the second value the value based on log \( K_{ow} \).
## Annex III – Overview of dose-response modelling results

### Table 36: Effect dose lower limits and upper limits for parameters observed in Craig (2013) (both sexes), Haas (2009) (both sexes), MacKenzie (2010) (both sexes), and Edwards (2010a) (males).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter effect</th>
<th>Chronic rat, final sacrifice</th>
<th>Chronic rat, interim sacrifice</th>
<th>Subchronic rat</th>
<th>Subchronic mouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Carcinoma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2120</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Adenoma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Cystic focal degeneration</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Single cell necrosis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Focal necrosis minimal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Focal necrosis mild</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Hypertrophy minimal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Hypertrophy mild</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Increased pigment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Mitotic figures minimal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Mitotic figures mild</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Relative weight</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Relative weight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Absolute weight</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liver Absolute weight</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0.0266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>-50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDH</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDH</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter/Effect</td>
<td>Chronic rat, final sacrifice</td>
<td>Chronic rat, interim sacrifice</td>
<td>Subchronic rat</td>
<td>Subchronic mouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile acids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL</td>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>EDL</td>
<td>EDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile acids</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirubin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL</td>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>EDL</td>
<td>EDU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirubin</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papilla edema</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular dilation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular hypertrophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total protein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total protein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albumin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globulin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globulin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/G ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/G ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spleen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute weight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spleen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>Parameter/ effect</td>
<td>Chronic rat, final sacrifice</td>
<td>Chronic rat, interim sacrifice</td>
<td>Subchronic rat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female EDL</td>
<td>Female EDU</td>
<td>Male EDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBC</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGB</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total reticulocytes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testes</td>
<td>Hyperplasia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = not available; Inf = infinity
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