ECHA
EUROPEAN CHEMICALS AGENCY

Helsinki, 27 September 2017

Addressee
[redacted]

Decision number: CCH-D-2114370492-49-01/F
Substance name: 2,2,4-trimethylpentane-1,3-diol
EC number: 205-619-1
CAS number: 144-19-4
Registration number: [redacted]
Submission number: [redacted]
Submission date: 22/03/2017
Registered tonnage band: 100-1000

DECISION ON A COMPLIANCE CHECK

Based on Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (the REACH Regulation), ECHA requests you to submit information on:

1. **Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day), oral route (Annex IX, Section 8.6.2.; test method: EU B.26./OECD TG 408) in rats with the registered substance.**

You have to submit the requested information in an updated registration dossier by **3 April 2019**. You also have to update the chemical safety report, where relevant.

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

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

Appeal

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

Authorised[1] by Ofelia Bercaru, Head of Unit, Evaluation E3

[1] As this is an electronic document, it is not physically signed. This communication has been approved according to ECHA's internal decision-approval process.

Appendix 1: Reasons

1. Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day), oral route (Annex IX, Section 8.6.2.)

In accordance with Articles 10(a) and 12(1) of the REACH Regulation, a technical dossier registered at 100 to 1000 tonnes per year must contain, as a minimum, the information specified in Annexes VII to IX to the REACH Regulation. The information to be generated for the dossier must fulfil the criteria in Article 13(4) of the same regulation.

A "sub-chronic toxicity study (90 day)" is a standard information requirement as laid down in Annex IX, Section 8.6.2. of the REACH Regulation. Adequate information on this endpoint needs to be present in the technical dossier for the registered substance to meet this information requirement.

In the technical dossier you have provided a study record for a 60-days study "Dietary feeding of 2,2,4-trimethyl 1,3-pentanediol TMDP (59-218). [redacted], 1967" (non GLP, no guideline followed). However, this study does not provide the information required by Annex IX, Section 8.6.2. for the following reasons:

a) exposure duration is less than 90 days (provision in Annex XI 1.1.2 (3) not met);

b) not all parameters of a OECD TG 408 are covered (provision of Annex XI 1.1.2 (2) not met). More specifically, the OECD guideline 408 requires three dose levels to be tested for 90 days, while as you reported that after 30 days only two dose groups were kept to continue this study up to 57 days. The guideline also requires to investigate more blood parameters in comparison to what you reported in the study (hematology analysis: white blood cell counts, differential counts, hemoglobin, and hematocrit; clinical chemistry: aspartate aminotransferase (SGOT), alanine aminotransferase (SGPT) and alkaline phosphatase. A full list of required measurements is outlined in the OECD TG 408, para 27-33. You indicated that urinalysis has not been performed in that study. You also indicated that the no behavioural parameters have been examined. Finally, you did not provide any numerical data on measured parameters, such as body weight, haematological and clinical biochemistry results (provision of Annex XI 1.2. (4) not met).

c) study has not been conducted according to the GLP, there is no indication of any quality assurance program applied to the study and therefore ECHA is not in a position to conclude on the validity of the results and their adequacy for the purpose of classification an labelling (provisions of Annex XI 1.1.2 (1)).

Based on the shortcomings as listed above, ECHA concludes that the results of the study may underestimate the toxicity of the registered substance as investigated in a repeated dose toxicity study according to OECD TG 408.

As explained above, the information provided on this endpoint for the registered substance in the technical dossier does not meet the information requirement. Consequently there is an information gap and it is necessary to provide information for this endpoint.

ECHA has evaluated the most appropriate route of administration for the study. Based on the information provided in the technical dossier and/or in the chemical safety report, ECHA considers that the oral route - which is the preferred one as indicated in ECHA *Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment* (version 6.0, July 2017) Chapter R.7a, Section R.7.5.4.3 - is the most appropriate route of administration. More specifically, even though the information indicates that human exposure to the registered substance by the inhalation route is likely, the available oral studies indicate a concern for systemic toxicity (adverse effects on liver, kidney, adrenal glands, and signs of neurotoxicity) that requires further information on repeated dose toxicity by the oral route. Hence, the test shall be performed by the oral route using the test method EU B.26./OECD TG 408.

According to the test method EU B.26./OECD TG 408 the rat is the preferred species. ECHA considers this species as being appropriate and testing should be performed with the rat.

Therefore, pursuant to Article 41(1) and (3) of the REACH Regulation, you are requested to submit the following information derived with the registered substance subject to the present decision: Repeated dose 90-day oral toxicity study (test method: EU B.26./OECD TG 408) in rats.

Appendix 2: Procedural history

For the purpose of the decision-making, this decision does not take into account any updates of your registration after the date when the draft decision was notified to you under Article 50(1) of the REACH Regulation.

The compliance check was initiated on 09 March 2017.

ECHA notified you of the draft decision and invited you to provide comments.

ECHA did not receive any comments by the end of the commenting period.

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

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

Appendix 3: Further information, observations and technical guidance

1. This compliance check decision does not prevent ECHA from initiating further compliance checks on the present registration at a later stage.

2. Failure to comply with the requests in this decision, or to otherwise fulfil the information requirements with a valid and documented adaptation, will result in a notification to the enforcement authorities of your Member State.

3. In relation to the information required by the present decision, the sample of the substance used for the new tests must be suitable for use by all the joint registrants. Hence, the sample should have a composition that is suitable to fulfil the information requirement for the range of substance compositions manufactured or imported by the joint registrants.

It is the responsibility of all joint registrants who manufacture or import the same substance to agree on the appropriate composition of the test material and to document the necessary information on their substance composition. In addition, it is important to ensure that the particular sample of the substance tested in the new tests is appropriate to assess the properties of the registered substance, taking into account any variation in the composition of the technical grade of the substance as actually manufactured or imported by each registrant.

If the registration of the substance by any registrant covers different grades, the sample used for the new tests must be suitable to assess these grades. Finally there must be adequate information on substance identity for the sample tested and the grades registered to enable the relevance of the tests to be assessed.