Helsinki, 18 June 2021

Addressees
Registrants of JS_12237-63-7_[redacted] listed in the last Appendix of this decision

Date of submission of the dossier subject of this decision
25/03/2019

Registered substance subject to this decision, ("'the Substance")
Substance name: Ferrate(4-), hexakis(cyano-C)-, Et 2-[6-(ethylamino)-3-(ethylimino)-2,7-dimethyl-3H-xanthen-9-yl]benzoate copper(2+) salts
EC number: 235-469-2
CAS number: 12237-63-7

Decision number: Please refer to the REACH-IT message which delivered this communication (in format CCH-D-XXXXXXXXXX-XX-XX/F)

DECISION ON A COMPLIANCE CHECK

Under Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (REACH), you must submit the information by ***23 September 2022***.

Requested information must be generated using the Substance unless otherwise specified.

Many of this type of organic pigments are listed in various national inventories of nanomaterials, such as the French nano-particulate substances reporting system.[1] In the case where the Substance is manufactured and/or imported in the European Union in nanoforms by any addressee of the present decision, the REACH Regulation (as amended by Regulation Commission Regulation (EU) 2018/1881) sets out explicit information requirements for nanoforms of substances. Manufacturers and/or importers of nanoforms must have fulfilled these specific information requirements by 1st January 2020. As far as the registration dossiers currently submitted on the Substance by any addressee of the present decision they do not cover any nanoform. Any incompliances identified in the present decision on the Substance relate only to information required on non-nanoforms.

Based on the above, the requested information in this present decision must be generated using exclusively non-nanoforms of the Substance.

A. Information required from all the Registrants subject to Annex VIII of REACH

1. In vitro cytogenicity study in mammalian cells (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2., test method OECD TG 473) or in vitro micronucleus study (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2., test method OECD TG 487);

2. Only if a negative result in Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2. is obtained, In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.3.; test method OECD TG 476 or TG 490);

[1] "*Dispositif de déclaration des substances à l'état nanoparticulaire* », Decree 2012-232 of French *Conseil d'Etat* of 17 February 2012.

3. and 4. Combined repeated dose toxicity study with the reproduction/developmental toxicity screening study (Annex VIII, Sections 8.6.1. and 8.7.1.; test method: OECD TG 422) in rats, oral route.

Reasons for the request(s) are explained in the following appendices:

- Appendix entitled "Reasons common to several requests";
- Appendix entitled "Reasons to request information required under Annex VIII of REACH".

Information required depends on your tonnage band

You must provide the information listed above for all REACH Annexes applicable to you, and in accordance with Articles 10(a) and 12(1) of REACH:

- the information specified in Annexes VII and VIII to REACH, for registration at 10-100 tpa.

You are only required to share the costs of information that they must submit to fulfil the information requirements.

How to comply with your information requirements

To comply with your information requirements you must submit the information requested by this decision in an updated registration dossier by the deadline indicated above. You must also update the chemical safety report, where relevant, including any changes to classification and labelling, based on the newly generated information.

You must follow the general testing and reporting requirements provided under the Appendix entitled "Requirements to fulfil when conducting and reporting new tests for REACH purposes". For references used in this decision, please consult the Appendix entitled "List of references".

Appeal

This decision, when adopted under Article 51 of REACH, may be appealed to the Board of Appeal of ECHA within three months of its notification to you. Please refer to http://echa.europa.eu/regulations/appeals for further information.

Failure to comply

If you do not comply with the information required by this decision by the deadline indicated above, ECHA will notify the enforcement authorities of your Member State.

Authorised[2] under the authority of Christel Schilliger-Musset, Director of Hazard Assessment

[2] 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 on Reasons common to several requests

1. **Assessment of the Grouping of substances and read-across approach under Annex XI, Section 1.5.**

You seek to adapt the following standard information requirements by applying a read-across approach in accordance with Annex XI, Section 1.5:

- In vitro cytogenicity study in mammalian cells or in vitro micronucleus study (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2.)
- In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.3.)
- Short-term repeated dose toxicity (28 day), (Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1.)
- Screening for reproductive/developmental toxicity (Annex VIII, Section 8.7.1.)

ECHA has considered the scientific and regulatory validity of your read-across approach(es) in general before assessing the specific standard information requirements in the following appendices.

Grouping of substances and read-across approach

Annex XI, Section 1.5. specifies two conditions which must be fulfilled whenever a read-across approach is used. Firstly, there needs to be structural similarity between substances which results in a likelihood that the substances have similar physicochemical, toxicological and ecotoxicological properties so that the substances may be considered as a group or category. Secondly, it is required that the relevant properties of a substance within the group may be predicted from data for reference substance(s) within the group (addressed under 'Predictions for (eco)toxicological properties').

Additional information on what is necessary when justifying a read-across approach can be found in the ECHA Guidance[3] and related documents[4, 5].

A. Predictions for toxicological properties

You have provided a read-across justification document with your comments on the draft decision.

You read-across between the following structurally similar substances:

In the dossier:

- Disodium 2-(3-oxo-6-oxidoxanthen-9-yl)benzoate (EC 208-253-0),
- 4,4'-(1E,1'E)-(3,3'-dichlorobiphenyl-4,4'-diyl)bis(diazene-2,1-diyl)bis(3-methyl-1-phenyl-1H-pyrazol (EC 222-530-3),
- 1,2-Benzenedicarboxylic acid, butyl phenylmethyl ester (EC 201-622-7),
- Sodium 4-[3,6-bis(diethylamino)-2,7-dimethylxanthenium-9-yl]benzene-1,3-disulfonate (EC 222-529-8), and
- 9-[2-(ethoxycarbonyl)phenyl]-3,6-bis(ethylamino)-2,7-dimethylxanthylium chloride (EC 213-584-9)

[3] Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals. 2008 (May) ECHA, Helsinki. 134. pp. Available online: https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13632/information_requirements_r6_en.pdf/77f49f81-b76d-40ab-8513-4f3a533b6ac9

[4] Read-Across Assessment Framework (RAAF). 2017 (March) ECHA, Helsinki. 60 pp. Available online: Read-Across Assessment Framework (https://echa.europa.eu/support/registration/how-to-avoid-unnecessary-testing-on-animals/grouping-of-substances-and-read-across)

[5] Read-across assessment framework (RAAF) - considerations on multi-constituent substances and UVCBs. 2017 (March) ECHA, Helsinki. 40 pp. Available online: https://doi.org/10.2823/794394

as source substances

Additionally, in your comments to the initial draft decision:
- Copper sulfate pentahydrate (EC 616-477-9),
- Tetrasodium hexacyanoferrate (EC: 237-081-9)

and the Substance as target substance.

In your comments, you have provided the following reasoning for the prediction of toxicological properties: "The target substance and the read-across analogues are group of chemicals whose physicochemical and human health properties are likely to be similar and show structural as well as functional similarities".

ECHA understands that you predict the properties of the Substance using a read-across hypothesis which assumes that different compounds have the same type of effects, and that the properties of your Substance are predicted to be quantitatively equal to those of the source substance.

Attached to your comments on the initial draft decision you submitted a read-across justification document. In your justification document you have indicated that 'Scenario 2' was selected for the analogue approach. You provided the following reasoning for the prediction of (eco)toxicological properties: "*read-across of environmental fate, ecotoxicological and toxicological data from an analogue may be justified on the basis of:*

- *Identifying the read across substances based on common functional groups and further filled with relate mechanistic approaches and finally fine-tuned with structural similarity using the QSAR Toolbox Version 3.4*
- *Common structural alerts or reactivity*
- *Common physico-chemical properties*
- *Likelihood of common breakdown products via biological/degradation processes*"

You conclude that "*the descriptors, various alerts and scenario (for analogue approach) which were taken into consideration for ecotoxicological and toxicological assessment as reported in this RA justification document obtained by using OECD QSAR toolbox v.3.4 of the target substance and source substances (i.e., read across analogues) were evaluated to be similar and therefore justified and appropriate".*

As the analogues are used as source substances to predict the property of the Substance, we understand that you have adapted the standard information requirements under Annex XI, Section 1.5 to REACH (grouping and read-across). Based on the above, you used the QSAR Toolbox for the identification of analogues and use information on these analogues to predict the properties of the Substance using a read-across hypothesis which assumes that different compounds have the same type of effects. The properties of your Substance are predicted to be quantitatively equal to those of the source substance(s).

ECHA notes the following shortcoming(s) with regards to prediction(s) of toxicological properties.

Read-across documentation

Annex XI, Section 1.5 requires that whenever read-across is used adequate and reliable documentation of the applied method must be provided. Such documentation must provide a

justification for the read-across including a hypothesis, explanation of the rationale for the prediction of properties and robust study summary(ies) of the source study(ies).[6]

You have provided studies conducted with other substances than your Substance in order to comply with the REACH information requirements. In your dossier you have not provided any documentation as to why this information is relevant for your Substance.

In the absence of such documentation, ECHA cannot verify that the properties of your Substance can be predicted from the data on the source substance(s).

In your comments on the initial draft decision you provided a read across justification but with shortcomings identified in this Appendix.

Supporting information - Missing supporting information to compare properties of the substances

Annex XI, Section 1.5 of the REACH Regulation states that "physicochemical properties, human health effects and environmental effects or environmental fate may be predicted from data for reference substance(s)". For this purpose "it is important to provide supporting information to strengthen the rationale for the read-across"[7]. The set of supporting information should allow to verify the crucial aspects of the read-across hypothesis and establish that the properties of the Substance can be predicted from the data on the source substance(s). Supporting information must include bridging studies to compare properties of the Substance and source substances.

As indicated above, your read-across hypothesis is based on the assumption that the structurally similar substances cause the same type of effect(s). In this context, relevant, reliable and adequate information allowing to compare the properties of the Substance and of the source substance(s) is necessary to confirm that both types of substances cause the same type of effects. Such information can be obtained, for example, from bridging studies of comparable design and duration for the Substance and of the source substance(s).

You have provided studies in the dossier and the comments on the draft decision which have been conducted with source substances. You have not provided studies that were conducted with the Substance on the endpoints for which you have submitted a read-across adaptation.

Therefore, there is no endpoint-specific information (bridging studies) available to compare properties of the source substances with those of the target substance. The data set reported in the technical dossier and with the comments on the draft decision does not include relevant, reliable and adequate information for the Substance and of the source substance(s) to support your read-across hypothesis.

In the absence of such information, you have not established that the Substance and of the source substance(s) are likely to have similar properties. Therefore, you have not provided sufficient supporting information to strengthen the rationale for the read-across.

B. Conclusions on the read-across approach

As explained above, you have not established that relevant properties of the Substance can be predicted from data on the analogue substance. Therefore, your adaptation does not

[6] Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.6.1
[7] Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.2.1.f

comply with the general rules of adaptation as set out in Annex XI, Section 1.5. and your grouping and read-across approach is rejected.

2. Assessment of your weight of evidence adaptation under Annex XI, Section 1.2.

You have adapted the following standard information requirements by applying weight of evidence (WoE) adaptation in accordance with Annex XI, Section 1.2:

1. In vitro cytogenicity study in mammalian cells or in vitro micronucleus study (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2.)
2. In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.3.)
3. Short-term repeated dose toxicity (28 day), (Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1.)
4. Screening for reproductive/developmental toxicity (Annex VIII, Section 8.7.1.)

For these endpoints you provided studies with analogue substances.

Your weight of evidence adaptation raises the same deficiencies irrespective of the information requirement for which it is invoked. Accordingly, ECHA addressed these deficiencies in the present Appendix, before assessing the specific standard information requirements in the following appendices.

Annex XI, Section 1.2 states that there may be sufficient weight of evidence weight of evidence from several independent sources of information leading to assumption/conclusion that a substance has or has not a particular dangerous (hazardous) property, while information from a single source alone is insufficient to support this notion.

According to ECHA Guidance R.4.4, a weight of evidence adaptation involves an assessment of the relative values/weights of the different sources of information submitted. The weight given is based on the reliability of the data, consistency of results/data, nature and severity of effects, and relevance of the information for the given regulatory information requirement. Subsequently, relevance, reliability, consistency and results of these sources of information must be balanced in order to decide whether they together provide sufficient weight to conclude that the Substance has or has not the (dangerous) property investigated by the required study.

Annex XI, Section 1.2. requires that adequate and reliable documentation is provided to describe your weight of evidence approach.

However, for each relevant information requirement, you have not submitted any explanation why the sources of information provide sufficient weight of evidence leading to the conclusion/assumption that the Substance has or has not a particular dangerous property.

In spite of this critical deficiency, ECHA has nevertheless assessed the validity of your adaptation.

These issues identified below are relevant for all the information requirements in which you applied a weight of evidence.

1. Reliability of the read across approach

Section 1 of the present Appendix identifies deficiencies of the grouping and read across approach used in your dossier and your comments on your initial draft decision. These findings

apply equally to the sources of information relating to analogue substances submitted under your weight of evidence adaptations.

Additional issues related to weight of evidence are addressed under the corresponding endpoints.

Appendix A: Reasons to request information required under Annex VIII of REACH

1. In vitro cytogenicity study in mammalian cells or in vitro micronucleus study

An *in vitro* cytogenicity study in mammalian cells or an *in vitro* micronucleus study is an information requirement under Annex VIII to REACH (Section 8.4.2.).

You have adapted the standard information requirement mentioned above according to Annex XI, Section 1.2. (weight of evidence) and Annex XI 1.5 (grouping of substances and read-across) of REACH.

In support of your adaptations, you have provided the following sources of information:

i. In vitro Chromosome aberration study (1990) with an analogue substance (EC 208-253-0)
ii. In vitro Chromosome aberration study (1987) with an analogue substance (EC 201-622-7).

In your comments you explain that you will remove the study ii. as you consider that the structural similarity is relatively low.

Instead, you refer to two other studies:

iii. An *in vitro* chromosomal aberration test (1990) with an analogue substance (EC 208-253-0)
iv. An *in vitro* chromosomal aberration test (1990) with an analogue substance (EC 213-584-9).

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 1., your adaptation under Annex XI, Section 1.5 in your dossier and in your comments is rejected.

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 2., the weight of evidence must fulfill the information requirement based on relevant and reliable sources of information. These sources of information must provide sufficient weight to conclude that the Substance has or has not the dangerous property investigated by the required study.

To fulfil the information requirement, normally a study according to OECD TG 473 or OECD TG 487 must be provided. The key element investigated by these tests is detection and quantification of structural or numerical chromosomal aberrations in cultured mammalian cells including data on the cytotoxicity and the frequency of cells with chromosomal aberrations or micronuclei.

All the sources of information you provided investigate detection and quantification of structural or numerical chromosomal aberrations in cultured mammalian cells. Therefore, they provide information that would contribute to the conclusion on this key element.

However, the reliability of these sources of information, including those provided in your comments, is significantly affected by the deficiencies identified in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 2.

Taken together, even if these sources of information provide information on the key eleemnt, their reliability is affected so significantly that they cannot be taken into consideration in a weight of evidence approach.

Therefore, it is not possible to conclude, based on any source of information alone or considered together, whether your Substance has or has not the particular dangerous property foreseen to be investigated by the required study.

Based on the above, your adaptation is rejected and the information you provided does not fulfil the information requirement. A study according to OECD TG 473 or OECD TG 487 must be provided.

In your comments on the initial draft decision you indicate that you are planning to submit a testing proposal for an *in vivo* chromosomal aberration study (OECD TG 475) on the basis of positive results obtained with source substances.
It should be noted that, as explained above, your read-across adaptation according to Annex XI, Section 1.5. is rejected for the two *in vitro* studies at Annex VIII.

2. In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells

An *in vitro* gene mutation study in mammalian cells is an information requirement under Annex VIII to REACH (Section 8.4.3.) in case of a negative result in the in vitro gene mutation test in bacteria and the in vitro cytogenicity test.

Your dossier contains (i) a negative result for *in vitro* gene mutation study in bacteria with the Substance, and (ii) an adaptation for an *in vitro* cytogenicity study in mammalian cells or *in vitro* micronucleus study.

The information for the *in vitro* cytogenicity study in mammalian cells provided in the dossier is rejected for the reasons provided in Section 1 of this Appendix A.

You have adapted the standard information requirement mentioned above according to Annex XI, Section 1.2. (weight of evidence) and Annex XI 1.5 (grouping of substances and read-across) of REACH.

In support of your adaptation, you have provided the following sources of information:

i. In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells (1997) with an analogue substance (EC 201-622-7)
ii. In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells (1989) with an analogue substance (EC 213-584-9).

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 1., your adaptation under Annex XI, Section 1.5 is rejected.

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 2., the weight of evidence must fulfill the information requirement based on relevant and reliable sources of information. These sources of information must provide sufficient weight to conclude that the Substance has or has not the dangerous property investigated by the required study.

To fulfil the information requirement, normally a study according to OECD TG 476/490 or OECD TG 488 must be provided. The key element investigated by these tests is detection and quantification of gene mutations (point mutations, frame-shift mutations, small deletions, etc.) including data on the frequency of mutant colonies in cultured mammalian cells (*in vitro*) or mutant frequency for each tissue in mammals (*in vivo*).

All the sources of information you provided investigate detection and quantification of structural or numerical chromosomal aberrations in cultured mammalian cells. Therefore, they provide information that would contribute to the conclusion on this key element.

However, the reliability of these sources of information is significantly affected by the deficiencies identified in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 2.

Taken together, even if these sources of information provide information on the key element, their reliability is affected so significantly that they cannot be taken into consideration in a weight of evidence approach.

Therefore, it is not possible to conclude, based on any source of information alone or considered together, whether your Substance has or has not the particular dangerous property foreseen to be investigated by the required study. Therefore, your adaptation is rejected.

Based on the above, the information you provided does not fulfil the information requirement. A study according to OECD TG 476/490 or OECD TG 488 must be provided.

In your comments on the initial draft decision you indicate that you are planning to submit a testing proposal for an *in vivo* chromosomal aberration study (OECD TG 475). However, a chromosomal aberration study does not fulfil the information requirement for *in vitro* gene mutation study in mammalian cells (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.3.).

3. Short-term repeated dose toxicity (28 day), (Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1.)

A Short-term repeated dose toxicity study (28 days) is a standard information requirement under Annex VIII to REACH (Section 8.6.1.).

You have adapted the standard information requirement mentioned above according to Annex XI, Section 1.2. (weight of evidence) and Annex XI 1.5 (grouping of substances and read-across) of REACH.

You have provided in support an OECD TG 422 study (2002) with an analogue substance.

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 1., your adaptation under Annex XI, Section 1.5 is rejected.

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 2., the weight of evidence must fulfil the information requirement based on relevant and reliable sources of information. These sources of information must provide sufficient weight to conclude that the Substance has or has not the dangerous property investigated by the required study. In addition to the deficiency identified in that Appendix, we have identified the following critical deficiency:

Annex XI, Section 1.2 states that there may be sufficient weight of evidence "from several independent sources of information".

You have only provided one source of information.

Based on the above, the information you provided does not fulfil the information requirement. Consequently there is an information gap and it is necessary to provide information for this endpoint.

When there is no information available neither for the 28-day repeated dose toxicity endpoint (EU B.7, OECD TG 407), nor for the screening study for reproductive/ developmental toxicity (OECD TG 421 or TG 422), the conduct of a combined repeated dose toxicity study with the

reproduction/developmental toxicity screening test (OECD TG 422) is preferred to ensure that unnecessary animal testing is avoided. Such an approach offers the possibility to avoid carrying out a 28-day study according to OECD TG 407, because the OECD TG 422 can at the same time fulfil the information requirement of REACH Annex VIII, 8.6.1 and that of REACH Annex VIII, 8.7.1.[8]

Information on study design

Referring to the criteria provided in Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1, Column 2, the oral route is the most appropriate route of administration to investigate repeated dose toxicity, because even though the substance is reported to occur as a dust with a significant proportion (>1% on weight basis) of particles of inhalable size (MMAD < 50 µm), the proportion of respirable particles is low (0.3% < 10µm) and the uses reported in the dossier do not indicate a specific concern for exposure via inhalation.

Therefore the study must be performed according to the OECD TG 422, in rats and with oral administration of the Substance.

4. Screening for reproductive/developmental toxicity

A Screening for reproductive/developmental toxicity study (test method: EU B.63/OECD TG 421 or EU B.64/OECD TG 422) is a standard information requirement under Annex VIII to REACH (Section 8.7.1), if there is no evidence from analogue substances, QSAR or in vitro methods that the Substance may be a developmental toxicant. There is no information available in your dossier indicating that your Substance may be a developmental toxicant.

You have adapted the standard information requirement mentioned above according to Annex XI, Section 1.2. (weight of evidence) and Annex XI 1.5 (grouping of substances and read-across) of REACH.

In support of your adaptations, you have provided the following sources of information:

i. Two teratogenicity studies (1986, 2004) with analogue substances (EC 208-253-0 and EC 222-529-8).
ii. Combined repeated dose toxicity study with the reproduction/developmental toxicity screening test (OECD 422, 2018) with an analogue substance (EC 222-530-3).

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 1., your adaptation under Annex XI, Section 1.5 is rejected.

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 2., the weight of evidence must fulfill the information requirement based on relevant and reliable sources of information. These sources of information must provide sufficient weight to conclude that the Substance has or has not the dangerous property investigated by the required study.

To fulfil the information requirement, normally a study according to OECD TG 421 or OECD TG 422 must be provided. The key elements investigated by these tests are 1) sexual function and fertility, 2) toxicity to offspring, and 3) systemic toxicity.

All the sources of information you provided investigate 1) sexual function and fertility, 2) toxicity to offspring, and 3) systemic toxicity. Therefore, they provide information that would contribute to the conclusion on these key elements.

[8] ECHA Guidance, Section R.7.6.2.3.2., pages 484 to 485 of version 6.0 – July 2017. (https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13632/information_requirements_r7a_en.pdf)

However, the reliability of these sources of information is significantly affected by the deficiencies identified in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, section 2.

Taken together, even if these sources of information provide information on the key elements, their reliability is affected so significantly that they cannot be taken into consideration in a weight of evidence approach.

Therefore, it is not possible to conclude, based on any source of information alone or considered together, whether your Substance has or has not the particular dangerous property foreseen to be investigated by the required study. Therefore, your adaptation is rejected.

Based on the above, the information you provided does not fulfil the information requirement.

When there is no information available neither for the 28-day repeated dose toxicity endpoint (EU B.7, OECD TG 407) (as explained above under section 3.), nor for the screening study for reproductive/developmental toxicity (OECD TG 421 or TG 422), the conduct of a combined repeated dose toxicity study with the reproduction/developmental toxicity screening test (OECD TG 422) is preferred to ensure that unnecessary animal testing is avoided. Such an approach offers the possibility to avoid carrying out a 28-day study according to OECD TG 407, because the OECD TG 422 can at the same time fulfil the information requirement of REACH Annex VIII, 8.6.1 and that of REACH Annex VIII, 8.7.1.[9]

In your comments on the initial draft decision you indicated your intention to adapt this information requirement according to Annex VIII, Section 8.7.1, Column 2, by submitting a pre-natal developmental toxicity study with the Substance. However, the request for a pre-natal developmental toxicity study according to Annex IX, Section 8.7.2 was removed from this decision. It should also be noted that such study is considered at Annex VIII only in case of serious concerns, which you do not identify in your comments.

Information on study design

A study according to the test method EU B.64/OECD TG 422 must be performed in rats with oral[10] administration of the Substance.

[9] ECHA Guidance, Section R.7.6.2.3.2., pages 484 to 485 of version 6.0 – July 2017. (https://echa.europa.eu/documents/10162/13632/information_requirements_r7a_en.pdf)
[10] ECHA Guidance R.7a, Section R.7.6.2.3.2.

Appendix B: Requirements to fulfil when conducting and reporting new tests for REACH purposes

A. Test methods, GLP requirements and reporting

1. Under Article 13(3) of REACH, all new data generated as a result of this decision must be conducted according to the test methods laid down in a European Commission Regulation or to international test methods recognised by the Commission or ECHA as being appropriate.

2. Under Article 13(4) of REACH, ecotoxicological and toxicological tests and analyses must be carried out according to the GLP principles (Directive 2004/10/EC) or other international standards recognised by the Commission or ECHA.

3. Under Article 10(a)(vi) and (vii) of REACH, all new data generated as a result of this decision must be reported as study summaries, or as robust study summaries, if required under Annex I of REACH. See ECHA Practical Guide on How to report robust study summaries[11].

B. Test material

Before generating new data, you must agree within the joint submission on the chemical composition of the material to be tested (Test Material) which must be relevant for all the registrants of the Substance.

1. Selection of the Test material(s)

   The Test Material used to generate the new data must be selected taking into account the following:
   - the variation in compositions reported by all members of the joint submission,
   - the boundary composition(s) of the Substance,
   - the impact of each constituent/ impurity on the test results for the endpoint to be assessed. For example, if a constituent/ impurity of the Substance is known to have an impact on (eco)toxicity, the selected Test Material must contain that constituent/ impurity.

2. Information on the Test Material needed in the updated dossier
   - You must report the composition of the Test Material selected for each study, under the "Test material information" section, for each respective endpoint study record in IUCLID.
   - The reported composition must include all constituents of each Test Material and their concentration values and other parameters relevant for the property to be tested.

This information is needed to assess whether the Test Material is relevant for the Substance and whether it is suitable for use by all members of the joint submission.

Technical instructions on how to report the above is available in the manual on How to prepare registration and PPORD dossiers[12].

[11] https://echa.europa.eu/practical-guides
[12] https://echa.europa.eu/manuals

Appendix C: Procedure

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

ECHA followed the procedure detailed in Articles 50 and 51 of REACH.

The compliance check was initiated on 22 May 2019.

The decision making followed the procedure of Article 51 of the REACH Regulation, as described below:

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

ECHA took into account your comments and did amend the request(s) and did amend the deadline(s).

Due to a cease of manufacture, the following three requests have been removed from this draft decision: Justification for an adaptation of a Short-term repeated dose toxicity (28 day); Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day); Pre-natal developmental toxicity study. In addition the removal of these requests, has resulted in the removal of the 24 months deadline. There is now only one deadline of 12 months for the remaining requests.

ECHA notified the draft decision to the competent authorities of the Member States for proposals for amendment.

ECHA received proposal(s) for amendment and modified the draft decision.

ECHA invited you to comment on the proposed amendment(s) and referred the modified draft decision to the Member State Committee.

ECHA received comments from one of the addressees of this decision regarding data sharing and lead registrant appointment. Those comments are not specific to the proposed amendment. ECHA has addressed the comments in a separate communication to the addressee that has submitted them. The comments were not taken into account by the Member State Committee as they were considered to be outside of the scope of Article 51(5).

The Member State Committee reached a unanimous agreement on the draft decision in its MSC-74 written procedure and ECHA took the decision according to Article 51(6) of the REACH Regulation.

Appendix D: List of references - ECHA Guidance[13] and other supporting documents

Evaluation of available information
Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.4 (version 1.1., December 2011), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.4 where relevant.

QSARs, read-across and grouping
Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.6 (version 1.0, May 2008), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.6 where relevant.

Read-across assessment framework (RAAF, March 2017)[14]

RAAF - considerations on multiconstituent substances and UVCBs (RAAF UVCB, March 2017)

Physical-chemical properties
Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.7a (version 6.0, July 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.7a in this decision.

Toxicology
Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.7a (version 6.0, July 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.7a in this decision.

Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.7c (version 3.0, June 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.7c in this decision.

Environmental toxicology and fate
Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.7a (version 6.0, July 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.7a in this decision.

Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.7b (version 4.0, June 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.7b in this decision.

Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.7c (version 3.0, June 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.7c in this decision.

PBT assessment
Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.11 (version 3.0, June 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.11 in this decision.

Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment, Chapter R.16 (version 3.0, February 2016), referred to as ECHA Guidance R.16 in this decision.

Data sharing
Guidance on data-sharing (version 3.1, January 2017), referred to as ECHA Guidance on data sharing in this decision.

OECD Guidance documents[15]

[13] https://echa.europa.eu/guidance-documents/guidance-on-information-requirements-and-chemical-safety-assessment
[14] https://echa.europa.eu/support/registration/how-to-avoid-unnecessary-testing-on-animals/grouping-of-substances-and-read-across
[15] http://www.oecd.org/chemicalsafety/testing/series-testing-assessment-publications-number.htm

Guidance Document on aqueous–phase aquatic toxicity testing of difficult test chemicals – No 23, referred to as OECD GD 23.

Guidance document on transformation/dissolution of metals and metal compounds in aqueous media – No 29, referred to as OECD GD 29.

Guidance Document on Standardised Test Guidelines for Evaluating Chemicals for Endocrine Disruption – No 150, referred to as OECD GD 150.

Guidance Document supporting OECD test guideline 443 on the extended one-generation reproductive toxicity test – No 151, referred to as OECD GD 151.

Appendix E: List of the registrants to which the decision is addressed and the corresponding information requirements applicable to them

Registrant Name	Registration number	(Highest) Data requirements to be fufilled
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

Note: where applicable, the name of a third party representative (TPR) may be displayed in the list of recipients whereas the decision is sent to the actual registrant.