

Helsinki, 17 December 2020

Addressees

Registrants of FAES 12-14 Na_new listed in the last Appendix of this decision

Date of submission for the jointly submitted dossier subject of this decision

18/03/2019

Registered substance subject to this decision, hereafter 'the Substance'

Substance name: Alcohols, C12-14, ethoxylated, sulfates, sodium salts

EC number: 500-234-8

CAS number: 68891-38-3

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

Based on Article 41 of Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 (REACH), ECHA requests that you submit the information listed below by the deadline of **24 March 2023**.

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

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

1. In vitro gene mutation study in bacteria (Annex VII, Section 8.4.1.; test method EU B.13/14. / OECD TG 471);
2. Short-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex VII, Section 9.1.1.; test method EU C.2./OECD TG 202);
3. Growth inhibition study aquatic plants (Annex VII, Section 9.1.2.; test method EU C.3./OECD TG 201);
4. Ready biodegradability (Annex VII, Section 9.2.1.1.; test method OECD TG 301B/C/D/F or OECD TG 310);

B. 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 VII, Section 8.4.1. and 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);
3. Justification for an adaptation of a Short-term repeated dose toxicity (28 day),

(Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1.) based on the study requested under Section C.;

4. Short-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex VIII, Section 9.1.3.; test method OECD TG 203);

C. Information required from all the Registrants subject to Annex IX of REACH

1. Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day), oral route (Annex IX, Section 8.6.2.; test method OECD TG 408) in rats;
2. Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex IX, Section 8.7.2.; test method OECD TG 414) in a first species (rat or rabbit), oral route;
3. Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex IX, Section 9.1.5.; test method EU C.20./OECD TG 211);
4. Long-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex IX, Section 9.1.6.1.; test method OECD TG 210);

D. Information required from all the Registrants subject to Annex X of REACH

1. Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex X, Section 8.7.2.; test method OECD TG 414) in a second species (rat/rabbit), oral route.

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

- Appendix entitled "Reasons common to several requests";
- Appendices entitled "Reasons to request information required under Annexes VII to X of REACH", respectively.

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 Annex VII to REACH, for registration at 1-10 tonnes per year (tpa), or as a transported isolated intermediate in quantity above 1000 tpa;
- the information specified in Annexes VII and VIII to REACH, for registration at 10-100 tpa;
- the information specified in Annexes VII, VIII and IX to REACH, for registration at 100-1000 tpa;
- the information specified in Annexes VII to X to REACH, for registration at more than 1000 tpa.

You are only required to share the costs of information that you must submit to fulfil your 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". In addition, you should follow the general recommendations provided under the Appendix entitled "General recommendations 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.

Approved¹ under the authority of Christel Schilliger-Musset, Director of Hazard Assessment

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 on Reasons common to several requests

(i) Assessment of the Grouping of substances and read-across approach under Annex XI, Section 1.5.

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

- 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.)
- Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day), (Annex IX, Section 8.6.2.)
- Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex IX, Section 8.7.2.)
- Pre-natal developmental toxicity study in a second species (Annex X, Section 8.7.2.)
- Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex IX, Section 9.1.5.)
- Long-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex IX, Section 9.1.6.1.)

ECHA has considered the scientific and regulatory validity of your grouping and read-across approach 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 (addressed under 'Scope of the grouping'). 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 'Assessment of prediction(s)').

Additional information on what is necessary when justifying a read-across approach can be found in the ECHA Guidance R.6 and related documents.

A. Scope of the grouping

i. Description of the grouping

In your registration dossier you have formed a group (category) of 'alcohol ethoxylate sulphates' (AES). You have provided a read-across justification document in IUCLID Section 13.

Registered category members are listed here. Your category justification document also covers unregistered substances without further data in the dossier, and therefore they are not addressed.

Substance name	EC number	CAS number
Alcohols, C12-13, branched and linear, ethoxylated, sulfates, sodium salt (EO 1-2,5)	500-513-4	161074-79-9
Alcohols, C12-14, ethoxylated, sulfates, sodium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-234-8	68891-38-3

Alcohols, C12-18, ethoxylated, sulfates, sodium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-189-4	68081-91-4
Alcohols, C9-11, branched and linear, ethoxylated, sulfates, ammonium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-464-9	160901-27-9
Alcohols, C8-10, ethoxylated, sulfates, ammonium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-233-2	68891-29-2
Alcohols, C12-14 (linear, even-numbered), ethoxylated, sulfates, ammonium salts, < 2.5 mol EO	939-575-6	n.a.
Alcohols, C12-14 (even-numbered), ethoxylated (<=2.5 moles EO), sulfated, monoisopropanolamine salt	932-185-7	1187742-72-8
Alcohols, C12-14 (even-numbered), ethoxylated, magnesium salts, < 2.5 mol EO	939-578-2	n.a.
Alcohols, C8-10, ethoxylated, sulfates, sodium salts	939-523-2	n.a.
Alcohols, C9-11, branched and linear, ethoxylated, sulfates, sodium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-465-4	160901-28-0
Alcohols, C10-12 (even-numbered), ethoxylated (EO 1-2,5), sulfated, sodium salts	939-597-6	68610-66-2
Alcohols, C16-18 and C18-unsatd., ethoxylated, sulfates, sodium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-345-1	157627-95-7
Alcohols, C10-16, ethoxylated, sulfates, mono(hydroxyethyl)ammonium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-343-0	157627-92-4
Alcohols, C10-16, ethoxylated, sulfates, triethanolammonium salts (EO 1-2,5)	500-344-6	157627-94-6

Your reasoning for the grouping the substances can be summarised as: Alkyl ether sulfates are anionic surfactants with common characteristics. These are an aliphatic ethoxylated chain with a polar sulfate group neutralized with a counter-ion. The hydrophobic part is a hydrocarbon chain with a length of 8 to 18 carbon atoms (C8-C18). The polar and hydrophilic ethoxy-sulfate group confers the surfactant properties and enables the use of these substances as anionic surfactants.

Your definition of the applicability domain of the category can be summarised as: alkyl ether sulfates with predominantly linear but also branched alkyl chains, with lengths of C8-C18, including C18 unsaturated chains. The ethoxylation degree is less than 2,5. Permissible counter-ions are: sodium(Na^+), magnesium (Mg^{2+}), ammonium (NH_4^+), and ammonium alcohols: mono(hydroxyethyl)ammonium (MEA), tri(hydroxyethyl)ammonium (TEA), mono-(2-hydroxypropyl)ammonium (MIPA), or tri-(2-hydroxypropyl)ammonium (TIPA).

ii. Assessment of the grouping

ECHA notes the following shortcomings with regards to your grouping approach.

Characterisation of the group members

Annex XI, Section 1.5 of the REACH Regulation provides that “*substances whose physicochemical, toxicological and ecotoxicological properties are likely to be similar or follow a regular pattern as a result of chemical similarity may be considered as group.*”

According to the ECHA Guidance, “*in identifying a category, it is important that all potential category members are described as comprehensively as possible*”, because the purity profile and composition can influence the overall toxicity/properties of the potential category

members.² Therefore, qualitative and quantitative information on the compositions of the category members should be provided to confirm the category membership.

Furthermore, the provided information for categories consisting of UVCB (Unknown or Variable composition, Complex reaction products or of Biological materials) substances needs to include qualitative compositional information of the individual constituents of the category members; as well as quantitative characterisation in the form of information on the concentration of the individual constituents of these substances; to the extent that this is measurable.³

You have defined the applicability domain of the category as explained above. Your read-across justification document contains limited compositional information for the members of your category. The category members include UVCBs of sulphated ethoxylated alcohols of various carbon chain lengths. However, the degree -or absence- of ethoxylation, as well as alkyl chain branching and its length, is not provided for the category members, and for all boundary compositions.

In your comments to the draft decision you indicate that you will *"include additional analytical data on the structure and compositional details of the substances"*.

ECHA notes your intention to provide this information. Should you provide this information in a subsequent update to your dossier ECHA will assess this information after the set deadline of this decision.

Without information on the distribution of the ethoxylate groups amongst constituents, including for certain constituents with a lack of ethoxylation, no qualitative or quantitative comparative assessment of the compositions of the different category members can be completed. Furthermore, differences in the alkyl chains (length, potential branching and saturation, as relevant) need to be accounted for. For a practical example please refer to the Appendix on test material characterisation at the end of this decision.

Therefore, the category membership cannot be confirmed.

B. Predictions of eco-/toxicological properties

Your read-across hypothesis common for the prediction of toxicological and ecotoxicological properties can be summarised as: Common route of synthesis, similar structural features (surfactant) and similar physico-chemical properties result in similar properties for metabolism, environmental fate, and essentially identical hazard profiles regarding human health. In addition, a trend of increasing toxicity with increasing alkyl carbon chain length can be observed for aquatic toxicity.

ECHA understands that you predict the properties of the Substance using a read-across hypothesis which assumes that different compounds have similar properties. The properties of your Substance are predicted to be quantitatively equal to those of the source substance for all endpoints except for aquatic toxicity, for which your prediction is based on an identified trend within the group.

You intend to predict the properties for the Substance from information obtained from studies with category members, which are listed in Section **(iii.)** of this Appendix.

² Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.4.1

³ Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.5.5

a. Shortcomings in the predictions common to both toxicological and ecotoxicological properties

ECHA notes the following shortcomings with regards to predictions of toxicological and ecotoxicological properties.

1. Adequacy and reliability of studies

According to Annex XI, Section 1.5., if the grouping concept is applied then in all cases the results to be read across should:

- be adequate for the purpose of classification and labelling and/or risk assessment;
- have adequate and reliable coverage of the key parameters addressed in the corresponding test method referred to in Article 13(3);
- have adequate and reliable documentation of the applied method.

a. test material identity

The Test Methods Regulation (EU) 440/2008, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2016/266, requires that *"if the test method is used for the testing of a [...] UVCB [...] sufficient information on its composition should be made available, as far as possible, e.g. by the chemical identity of its constituents, their quantitative occurrence, and relevant properties of the constituents"*. Therefore, the unambiguous characterisation of the composition of the source substance and test material used to generate the source data is required to evaluate the reliability and uncertainty associated with predicting properties of substances with potential substantial compositional differences. The composition of the selected test material must be reported in the respective endpoint study record, under the test material section.

Your read-across justification document contains compositional information for the members of your category. It states that the category members are UVCBs of sulphated ethoxylated alcohols of various carbon chain lengths and ranges of ethoxylation. The information on test materials provided in your dossier is limited to the generic name of UVCB substance and/or numerical identifier. The averaged degree of ethoxylation and test material purity are reported for some but not all studies. The range of ethoxylation (degree, including absence), as well as alkyl chain branching and its length, are not provided for any test materials.

Furthermore and in particular:

- a) No information on the composition within the purity of the "active compound" is given for any study except study 28};
- b) No information on the composition, other than the 'active compound', and the range of constituents* beyond the reported purity is given for any study except study 21}, 23}, 26}, 29};
- c) No information is provided for any study on the ethoxylation range and quantity of individual constituents, especially constituents without information on degree of ethoxylation except study 28};
- d) No details are provided in any study on how the average ethoxylation degree is determined for a substance (not relevant for the study 28});
- e) No quantification of constituents is provided for any study regarding the length, branching and saturation of alkyl chains.

*Note: "range of constituents" refers to identity and (definitive) concentrations of all

constituents as explained below, to characterize a test material batch.

Without comprehensive reporting of all constituents present in the test material (including their identity and concentrations) and without consideration of the distribution or absence of the ethoxylation amongst constituents with different carbon chain length, no qualitative or quantitative comparative assessment of the compositions of the different category members as test material and as registered substance can be completed. Furthermore, differences in the alkyl chains (length, potential branching and saturation) need to be accounted for. For a practical example please refer to the Appendix on test material characterisation at the end of this decision.

In your comments to the draft decision, you indicate that "*further characterisation of test materials used to generate source data will be provided*" and that dossier updates have been submitted for two category members (EC 500-233-2, EC 500-234-8), for ECHA to evaluate.

As ECHA has explained to you in the notification letter of the draft decision, for the purpose of the decision-making, this decision does not take into account any updates of registration dossiers after the date on which you were notified the draft decision according to Article 50(1) of the REACH Regulation. This is also reflected in ECHA's news alert of 26 November 2019 (<https://echa.europa.eu/-/echa-does-not-consider-dossier-updates-during-evaluation-decision-making>). The news alert explains that if new information becomes available after receipt of the draft decision, registrants must submit this information through their comments to the draft decision. The Agency will consider the information in the comments and may amend the decision accordingly.

However, you do not substantiate your comments with any of the above information, including definitive concentration of constituents. Therefore ECHA cannot assess from your comments if you have addressed the request(s).

Irrespective of whether or not the update addresses the shortcomings on test material, this does not address the other shortcomings identified for the affected endpoints. Therefore, this information will not allow ECHA to remove any of the requests.

ECHA will evaluate the relevance of your further test materials characterisation to address the specific properties under investigation for the category members, after the set deadline of this decision. This depends on whether the other shortcomings identified under the specific endpoint have been addressed.

ECHA is unable to confirm, based on the information in the original dossier and your comments to the draft decision, that the test materials are relevant for the Substance and to all the registrants of the Substance. Therefore, ECHA concludes that it is not possible to assess whether the attempted predictions are compromised by the composition of the test materials. Consequently, the corresponding study results are not adequate for the purpose of classification and labelling and/or risk assessment.

b. Further deficiencies

Other deficiencies are identified in the requests for specific information requirements in Appendices A-D.

They are explained in sections **(i.)B.b. Shortcomings in the prediction of toxicological properties** and **(i.)B.c. Shortcomings in the prediction of ecotoxicological properties** of this appendix, and endpoint-specific deficiencies under the request for a specific information requirement in Appendices **A-D**.

2. No basis for prediction

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)*".

According to the ECHA Guidance, "*the purity and impurity profiles of the substance and the structural analogue need to be assessed*", and "*the extent to which differences in the purity and impurities are likely to influence the overall toxicity needs to be addressed, and where technically possible, excluded*". The purity profile and composition can influence the overall toxicity/properties of the potential category members, including test materials.⁴ Therefore, qualitative and quantitative information on the compositions of the test materials should be provided to allow assessment whether the attempted predictions are compromised by the composition and/or impurities.

The provided 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 other category members. For categories consisting of UVCB (Unknown or Variable composition, Complex reaction products or of Biological materials) substances needs to include qualitative compositional information of the individual constituents of the test materials; as well as quantitative characterisation in the form of information on the concentration of the individual constituents of these substances; to the extent that this is measurable.⁵

The information on test materials provided in your dossier is limited to the generic name of UVCB substance and/or numerical identifier. The averaged degree of ethoxylation and test material purity are reported for some but not all studies. The range of ethoxylation (degree, including absence), as well as alkyl chain branching and its length, are not provided for any test materials.

No information on the ethoxylation degree of the individual constituents of the category members is provided in your dossier. Furthermore, no further details are provided on how the average ethoxylation degree is determined for a substance.

In your comments on the draft decision you indicate that "further characterisation of test materials used to generate source data will be provided". ECHA will evaluate this information after the set deadline of this decision. You state that the registration dossiers of two category members (EC 500-233-2, EC 500-234-8) were updated before the end of the commenting deadline. Please refer to ECHA's reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a**.

Without consideration of the distribution of the ethoxylation amongst constituents with different carbon chain length, no qualitative or quantitative comparative assessment of the compositions of the different test materials can be completed. Therefore, is not possible to assess whether the attempted predictions are compromised by the composition of the test materials and their relation to category members.

3. Data density

⁴ Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.4.1

⁵ Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.5.5

Annex XI, Section 1.5. provides that "*substances whose physicochemical, toxicological and eco-toxicological properties are likely to be similar or follow a regular pattern as result of structural similarity may be considered as a group or 'category' of substances.*"

According to the ECHA Guidance, one of the factors in determining the robustness of a category is the density and distribution of the available data across the category.⁶ To identify a regular pattern and/or to derive reliable prediction of the properties of the members of the category, adequate and reliable information covering the range of structural variations identified among the category members needs to be available.

Furthermore in larger categories there may be breaks in trends which could affect the reliability of interpolation.⁷ To confirm that there are no such breakpoints, adequate and reliable information needs to cover also substances within a range of homologous series.

In your dossier, you have provided the studies listed above.

In addition, you have provided toxicity data after repeated administration only for category members with apparently predominant alkyl chain lengths of C12-C14, without explaining why these would be representative.

For *in vitro* genotoxicity endpoints, the available information was generated with a maximum of two (A.VIII, 8.4.3) to three (A.VII, 8.4.1) substances out of 25+ category members.

The data set reported for all endpoints does not include relevant, reliable and adequate information for the category members to support your read-across hypothesis. This is due to the deficiencies of studies explained in the sections which relate to *adequacy, reliability and relevance* in sections **(i.)B.a.**, **(i.)B.b.** and **(i.)B.c.** of this appendix, as well as in the appendices on *reasons for the requests A-D*.

In the absence of such information for all endpoints, you have not established that the category members are likely to have similar properties. Therefore you have not provided sufficient supporting information to strengthen the rationale for the read-across.

Furthermore, information for category members with predominant alkyl chain lengths of 12-14 carbon atoms is not sufficient to establish a trend across a category with alkyl chains of 8-18 carbon atoms. In the absence of information on substances at the upper and lower borders of the category, it cannot be confirmed that there is no change in toxicity or breakpoint in trends within the given range of chain length.

For *in vitro* genotoxicity, information on a maximum of two to three substances per endpoint out of 25+ category members does not allow to conclude on the similarity of properties across the category, given the variations in alkyl chain length, branching, saturation and the effects of counter-ions.

In your comments to the draft decision, you indicate that "*representative substances will be identified for each sub-group. The definition of sub-groups and the identification of representative substances will be based on the most robust analytical characterisation and description of the compositions of the AES substances.*" Furthermore, you agree to generate new experimental data to address the existing deficiencies. You may include information from new approach methods or computational methods to further strengthen the approach. It is in

⁶ Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.1.5.

⁷ Guidance on information requirements and chemical safety assessment Chapter R.6: QSARs and grouping of Chemicals, Section R.6.2.2.2.

your discretion to generate and provide the necessary supporting information in order to justify your read-across adaptation or any other adaptation. If you do so, you are responsible for demonstrating the fulfilment of the requirements of the relevant Annex(es) of REACH. If it fails and the resulting data does not support, or even contradict, your read-across hypothesis or any other adaptation, you remain responsible for complying with this decision by the set deadline.

Therefore, the information provided in the assessed technical dossier and your comments to the draft decision is not sufficient to conclude that toxicological and ecotoxicological properties are likely to follow a regular pattern.

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

b. Shortcomings in the prediction of toxicological properties

1. Adequacy and reliability of studies – key parameters according to the test method regulation

Studies must be conducted in accordance with the corresponding test methods referred to in Article 13(3) and according to the provisions of the REACH Annexes. To be considered adequate, the studies you submitted have to cover the key parameters of OECD TGs 408, 414, 452. According to these test guidelines the studies must cover key parameters such as:

- a. Recommended species,
- b. Applicable treatment schedule,
- c. Investigations of clinical observations, clinical chemistry, histo-/pathology,
- d. Reporting of findings,
- e. Application of statistical methods used to derive effect levels.

You have not provided any information on the key parameters listed above for the studies 4}, 5}, 17}, 18}, 19}, 20}.

In the absence of such information, ECHA is unable to assess the adequacy of these studies and compliance with the above key parameters.

Therefore, ECHA is unable to assess whether the attempted predictions are compromised by the absence of key parameter investigations and concludes that the studies are unreliable.

2. Dosing regime

To be considered adequate, the studies you submitted have to cover the key parameters of OECD TGs 408, 411, 414, 416, 452, 475. According to these test guidelines, the dose levels must be set with the aim to induce systemic toxicity at the highest dose level but not suffering or death.

You have submitted the following studies, that have not achieved inducing systemic toxicity and the highest dose level is below the limit dose⁸: 1}, 3}, 4}, 5}, 6} 7}, 12}, 15}, 16}, 18}, 19}, 20}, 21}. The data reported in the dossier does not include details confirming the basis for the selection of the maximum studied dose to aim to induce toxicity but not suffering or death. The test material is not fully characterised (see **(i.)B.a.1**) in any of the studies 1} to 29}. No details were provided on the range of constituents and impurities of the test

⁸ ECHA Guidance, R.7a, Section 7.6

material in these studies. You did not explain for all studies whether the reported dose was corrected for purity or not.

The submitted studies have not investigated the hazardous properties using high enough dose levels. In addition to this, it is unclear for some studies whether the reported test doses are for the impure material tested or whether they have been corrected to the concentration of the Substance. If uncorrected, this aggravates the issue of low dosing. Therefore, you have not demonstrated that the dose level selection was high enough.

None of the studies fulfil the criteria set out in the OECD TGs 408, 411, 414, 416, 452, 475.

Therefore, they cannot be used for the grouping approach.

c. Shortcomings in the prediction of ecotoxicological properties

i. Aquatic toxicity

1. Adequacy of source studies provided for aquatic toxicity

The standard aquatic toxicity test guidelines OECD TG 202, OECD TG 203, OECD TG 210 and OECD TG 211 in combination with the revised OECD Guidance 23, ENV/JM/MONO(2000)6/REV1 applicable to difficult to test substances require that specific conditions listed in each guideline are met to ensure validity and reliability of the conducted test. The validity criteria and/or parameters of these TGs include (among other parameters):

- a) information on the total organic carbon (TOC) concentration present in the test medium;

Based on the information available in the registration dossiers of the category members and in the category justification document, members of the category are surface active, could be present in ionised form and have potential to degrade in the test medium. Therefore, these substances are difficult to test.

For the provided studies 22}, 23}, 27}, 28}, 29} there is no information reported in the registration dossier about total organic carbon concentration present in the test medium.

In the comments to the draft decision you note that information on TOC concentration is neither a reliability criterion in the cited toxicity test guidelines nor in the OECD Guidance 23. You further note that Annex 3 of OECD Guidance 23 states that standard test media used for aquatic hazard testing usually have a typical TOC concentration of < 2 mg/L, which is much lower than the typical TOC of surface water. Therefore, adsorption to dissolved organic carbon is presumably negligible and a mitigating effect on toxicity due to adsorption to dissolved organic carbon can be excluded. The aquatic ecotoxicity tests submitted for the AES category substances are mainly prepared with standard test media. You emphasise that all aquatic ecotoxicity tests prepared with standard medium (as opposed to natural water from rivers, ponds, lakes etc.) are conducted under worst-case conditions and a mitigation of toxicity by adsorption can be excluded. For this reason, you cannot agree with ECHA's argumentation that the studies are not reliable.

ECHA notes that providing the TOC concentration is not a validity criteria of these test guidelines, however information on water characteristics used for the test medium preparation need to be reported, and information on the TOC concentration is part of the water characteristics. Therefore, it is an example of the test specification (parameter) of the test guidelines.

The CLP Guidance, Section 1.1.3. explains that classification must be based on intrinsic hazards, i.e. the basic properties of a substance or mixture as determined in standard tests or by other means designed to identify hazards. As the CLP Regulation is hazard-based, the data on intrinsic properties must not take exposure into consideration. Similar considerations apply for the PBT assessment. As per Annex XIII of REACH, the PBT assessment should be based on data generated under 'relevant conditions', i.e. those conditions that allow for an objective assessment of the PBT/vPvB properties of a substance and not the PBT/vPvB properties of a substance in particular environmental conditions.

To allow identification of the intrinsic hazard property of a substance aquatic toxicity test guidelines (OECD TG 202, OECD TG 203, OECD TG 211, OECD TG 210) specify that the test medium should contain ≤ 2 mg/L of TOC. However, you have not demonstrated that this was adhered to.

Respective guidelines further specify that information on TOC in the test medium should be reported and identify how quality parameters, including TOC, of the test medium or of the dilution water which is used for the preparation of the test medium are determined. As explained above, it is important for defining intrinsic hazard property of a substance and use of results of the studies for hazard assessment, including classification and labelling, and PBT/vPvB assessment. Indeed, it is expected for the aquatic ecotoxicity tests prepared with standard media that there is no mitigation of toxicity by adsorption (e.g. for ionisable surface active substances which might possess high potential for adsorption). However, this should be confirmed with the information on TOC concentration in the test medium.

Thus, in order to allow an independent assessment of the studies submitted missing information on the TOC concentration in the test medium needs to be submitted.

Consequently, such studies (i) cannot address standard information requirements of REACH Annexes VII-X; (ii) are not adequate for the purpose of classification and labelling; and (iii) cannot be used as source studies.

C. Conclusions on the grouping of substances and read-across approach

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

(ii) Assessment of the identity of the test material

The following issue concerns the following information requirements:

- In vitro gene mutation study in bacteria (Annex VII, Section 8.4.1.)
- 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.)
- Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day), (Annex IX, Section 8.6.2.)
- Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex IX, Section 8.7.2.)
- Extended one-generation reproductive toxicity study (Annex X, Section 8.7.3.)
- Short-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex VII, Section 9.1.1.)
- Growth inhibition study aquatic plants (Annex VII, Section 9.1.2.)
- Ready biodegradability (Annex VII, Section 9.2.1.1.)
- Short-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex VIII, Section 9.1.3.)
- Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex IX, Section 9.1.5.)
- Long-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex IX, Section 9.1.6.1.)

You have provided studies listed in this appendix, section **(iii)** that you claim were conducted with the Substance.

To comply with these information requirements, the test material in a study must be representative for the Substance (Art. 10 and Recital 19 of REACH; ECHA Guidance R.4.1). The Test Methods Regulation (EU) 440/2008, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2016/266, requires that *"if the test method is used for the testing of a [...] UVCB [...] sufficient information on its composition should be made available, as far as possible, e.g. by the chemical identity of its constituents, their quantitative occurrence, and relevant properties of the constituents"*. Therefore, the unambiguous characterisation of the composition of the Substance and test material used to generate the data is required to evaluate the representativeness of the test material. The composition of the selected test material must be reported in the respective endpoint study record, under the test material section.

The information on test materials provided in your dossier is the same as explained in Section **(i.)B.a.1** of this Appendix.

The studies that you claim were conducted with the Substance (CAS 68891-38-3 and/or fatty alcohol (C12 - C14)- polyethyleneglycol (2EO)-ethersulfate sodium salt and/or Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts and/or Alcohols, C12-14(even numbered), ethoxylated < 2.5 EO, sulfates, sodium salts) carry the deficiencies listed in Section **(i.)B.a.1** of this Appendix.

In your comments to the draft decision you state that your registration dossier was updated before the end of the commenting deadline.

Please refer to ECHA's reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a**.

Therefore, the provided information is rejected.

(iii) List of studies addressed under sections (i) and (ii).

The studies whose deficiencies are addressed under sections (i) and (ii) are listed below. Studies on analogue substances are addressed under section (i) above, while studies indicated to be on the Substance (*) are addressed under section (ii).

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

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

- 1} 90-day oral study (OECD TG 408, 1994) with CAS 68891-38-3*
- 2} 90-day oral study (1977a) with CAS 68585-34-2
- 3} 91-day oral study (1977b) with CAS 68585-34-2
- 4} 90-day oral study (1967) with "Sodium lauryl (3EO) ethoxysulphate"
- 5} Chronic toxicity study (1962/1991) with "Lauryl ethoxysulphate"
- 6} Subchronic dermal 90-day study (1978) with CAS 68585-34-2
- 7} Subchronic dermal 90-day study (1976) with CAS 68585-34-2

In vitro gene mutation study in bacteria (Annex VII, Section 8.4.1.)

- 8} Ames test (OECD TG 471, 1994) with CAS 68891-38-3*
- 9} Ames test (OECD TG 471, 1996) with CAS 68891-38-3*
- 10} Ames test (OECD TG 471, 1993) with CAS 68891-38-3*
- 11} Ames test (OECD TG 471, 1996/1995/1994/1988) with CAS 68891-38-3*

In vitro cytogenicity study in mammalian cells or in vitro micronucleus study (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2.) or adaptation through an *in vivo* study such as In vivo mammalian bone marrow chromosomal aberration test (Annex IX, Section 8.4., column 2)

- 12} In vivo mammalian chromosome aberration test (OECD TG 475, 1995) with CAS 68891-38-3*

In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells (Annex VIII, Section 8.4.3.)

- 13} In vitro mammalian cell gene mutation test (OECD TG 476, 1995) with CAS 68891-38-3*
- 14} In vitro mammalian cell gene mutation test (OECD TG 476, 2012) with "*Fatty alcohol ether sulfate, sodium salt, C8-10 2EO*"

Screening for reproductive/developmental toxicity (Annex VIII, Section 8.7.1.) and/or Extended one-generation reproductive toxicity study (Annex X, Section 8.7.3.)

- 15} Two-generation reproductive toxicity study (OECD TG 416, 1999) with CAS 68891-38-3*

Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex IX, Section 8.7.2.) (in rats)

- 16} PNDT study (OECD 414, 1994) with CAS 68891-38-3*
- 17} PNDT study (OECD 414, 1981) with 68891-38-3
- 18} PNDT study (OECD 414, 1986) with 125301-92-0
- 19} PNDT study (OECD 414, 1989) with 125301-92-0
- 20} PNDT study (OECD 414, 1986) with 162063-19-6

Pre-natal developmental toxicity study in a second species (Annex X, Section 8.7.2.)

- 21} PNDT study (1972) with 68585-34-2 in 25 F New Zealand White rabbits

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

- 22} Key study (OECD TG 211) with a substance named Alkylethoxysulfate (AES) (EC number 500-233-2).
- 23} Supporting study (OECD TG 211) with a substance named Alkylethoxysulfate (AES) (EC number 500-223-8).
- 24} Supporting study (mesocosm study; OECD Series on Testing and Assessment, Number 53: Guidance Document on Simulated Freshwater Lentic Field Tests (Outdoor Microcosms and Mesocosms), ENV/JM/MONO(2006)17,) with a substance named Alkylethoxysulfate (AES) (EC number 500-223-8).
- 25} Supporting study (OECD TG 202, part II) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.

Long-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex IX, Section 9.1.6.1.)

- 26} Key study (OECD TG 204) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.
- 27} Supporting study (OECD TG 203, extended acute toxicity test 45 days) with a substance named Alkylethoxysulfate (AES) (EC number 500-223-8).
- 28} Supporting study (OECD TG 210) with a substance named sodium tetradecyl dioxyethylene sulfate; C14E2S.
- 29} Supporting study (OECD TG 203, extended acute toxicity test 45 days) with a substance named Alkylethoxysulfate (AES) (EC number 500-223-8).

Short-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates (Annex VII, Section 9.1.1.)

- 30} Key study (OECD TG 202) with a substance named fatty alcohol (C12 - C14)-

polyethyleneglycol (2EO)-ethersulfate sodium salt*.

Growth inhibition study aquatic plants (Annex VII, Section 9.1.2.)

- 31} Key study (OECD TG 201) with a substance named fatty alcohol (C12-C14) polyethyleneglycol-(2EO)-ethersulfate sodium salt*.
- 32} Supporting study (DIN 38412) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.
- 33} Supporting study (OECD TG 201) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.

Ready biodegradability (Annex VII, Section 9.2.1.1.)

- 34} Key study (EU Method C.4-A) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.
- 35} Supporting study (OECD TG 301A) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.
- 36} Supporting study (EU Method C.4-D) with a substance named Alcohols, C12-14(even numbered), ethoxylated < 2.5 EO, sulfates, sodium salts (EC number 500-234-8) (study number BS4/22/07)*.
- 37} Supporting study (OECD TG 301D) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts (report number R 9501450)*.
- 38} Supporting study (EU Method C.4-D) with a substance named Alcohols, C12-14(even numbered), ethoxylated < 2.5 EO, sulfates, sodium salts (EC number 500-234-8) (study number BS4/01/05)*.
- 39} Supporting study (OECD TG 301D) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts (report number R9501452)*.
- 40} Experimental study flagged as "other information" ("according to OECD requirements") with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.

Short-term toxicity testing on fish (Annex VIII, Section 9.1.3.)

- 41} Key study (OECD TG 203) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.
- 42} Supporting study (OECD TG 203) with a substance named Poly(oxy-1,2-ethanediyl), .alpha.-sulfo-.omega.-hydroxy-, C12-14-alkyl ethers, sodium salts*.

*The studies are claimed to have been conducted with the Substance.

(iv) Adequacy of aquatic toxicity studies

The standard aquatic toxicity test guidelines OECD TG 201, OECD TG 202 and OECD TG 203 in combination with the revised OECD Guidance 23, ENV/JM/MONO(2000)6/REV1 applicable to difficult to test substances require that specific conditions listed in each guideline are met to ensure validity and reliability of the conducted test. The validity criteria and key parameters of these TGs include (among other parameters):

- a) analytical monitoring of exposure concentrations throughout the test; and the results of the analytical determination of exposure concentrations and (if necessary) calculation of effect levels as measured concentrations;
- b) information on the total organic carbon concentration present in the test medium;

Based on the information available in the registration dossier the Substance is surface active, could be present in ionised form and might have potential to degrade in the test medium, i.e.

it is difficult to test.

There is no information reported in the registration dossier about analytical monitoring of exposure concentrations throughout the test for the studies 25}, 26}, 32}, 33}, 42} and about total organic carbon concentration present in the test medium for the studies 25}, 26}, 30}, 41}, 42}.

In the comments to the draft decision you state that your registration dossier was updated before the end of the commenting deadline.

Please refer to ECHAs reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a.**

Your comment to the draft decision on the TOC concentration is addressed in the section i.B.c.i.1 above.

Consequently, such studies (i) cannot address standard information requirements of REACH Annexes VII-X; (ii) are not adequate for the purpose of classification and labelling.

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

1. In vitro gene mutation study in bacteria

An *in vitro* gene mutation study in bacteria is a standard information requirement in Annex VII to REACH.

You have provided studies 8}, 9}, 10}, 11} to fulfil this information requirement. You claim that the test material was the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

Test material characterisation

As explained in Section (ii) in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation does not fulfil the requirements of REACH. In addition, the following endpoint-specific deficiency has been identified:

No study fulfilling the requirements in OECD TG 471

To fulfil the information requirement and the requirements for read across adaptations as explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, a study has to cover the key parameters of the applicable test guideline, in this case OECD 471 whose key parameters include: The test must be performed with 5 strains. These are four strains of *S. typhimurium* (TA98; TA100; TA1535; TA1537 or TA97a or TA97) and one strain which is either *S. typhimurium* TA102 or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* (pKM101).

None of the reported data for the studies you have provided for this information requirement includes results for the required fifth strain, *S. typhimurium* TA102 or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* (pKM101).

In your comments on the draft decision you state that the fifth Ames strain was not included in the test guideline OECD TG 471 at the time that the studies above were performed (Annex XI, Section 1.1.2). In support you provide reference to a recent publication (██████████ 2019) and the provided information in the dossier.

The adaptation rule in Annex XI, Section 1.1.2 imposes a number of cumulative conditions for an adaptation to be valid, in particular:

1. Adequate and reliable coverage of the key parameters foreseen to be investigated in the corresponding test methods referred to in Article 13(3), in this case those of OECD TG 471:
 - a) 5 strains including *S. typhimurium* TA102 or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* (pKM101).
2. Adequate and reliable documentation of the study is provided;

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

1. The above key parameters of an OECD TG 471 are not met by the provided study, because there is no
 - a) information on the specific modes of action investigated by *S. typhimurium* TA102 or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* or *E. coli* WP2 *uvrA* (pKM101).
2. The provided documentation in the endpoint study record is very limited and does not contain e.g. tabulated data.

The literature reference cited in your comments to the draft decision states "When including an in vitro assay that detects clastogens such as the in vitro chromosome aberration assay, the resultant battery would detect 99% of bacterial mutagens". ECHA notes that

- i. You did not provide reliable information with chromosome aberration assays, nor on gene mutation assays in mammalian cells which are part of genotoxicity testing batteries; and
- ii. OECD TG 471 in its current form has been internationally agreed for mutual acceptance of data and is an information requirement under REACH Annex VII Section 8.4.1 including the five strains listed above.

The information provided in the above studies does not cover the key parameters required by OECD TG 471.

In the comments to the draft decision you state that your registration dossier was updated before the end of the commenting deadline. Please see ECHA's reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a**.

Therefore, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

2. Short-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates

Short-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates is a standard information requirement in Annex VII to REACH.

You have provided a key study 30} to fulfil this information requirement. ECHA understands that you claim that this study was conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

- *Test material characterisation*

As explained in Section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation does not fulfil the requirements of REACH.

- *Adequacy of the study*

As explained in Section **(iv)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the provided study is not adequate.

Your comments to the draft decision specific to the short-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates are addressed in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests.

Thus, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

As the Substance is surface active, could be present in ionised form and have potential to degrade in the test medium, you need to consult the OECD Guidance Document (GD) 23 and ECHA Guidance, Chapter R7b, Table R.7.8-3 relating to the aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances, so that you choose the most appropriate design of the requested ecotoxicity test(s) and you best calculate and report the results of the test(s).

3. Growth inhibition study aquatic plants

Growth inhibition study aquatic plants is a standard information requirement in Annex VII to REACH.

You have provided studies 31}, 32}, 33} to fulfil this information requirement. ECHA understands that you claim that these studies were conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

- *Test material characterisation*

As explained in Section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation does not fulfil the requirements of REACH.

- *Adequacy of the study*

As explained in Section **(iv)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests none of the provided studies are adequate.

Your comments to the draft decision specific to the growth inhibition study aquatic plants are addressed in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests.

Thus, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

As the Substance is surface active, could be present in ionised form and have potential to degrade in the test medium, you need to consult the OECD Guidance Document (GD) 23 and ECHA Guidance, Chapter R7b, Table R.7.8-3 relating to the aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances, so that you choose the most appropriate design of the requested ecotoxicity test(s) and you best calculate and report the results of the test(s).

4. Ready biodegradability

Ready biodegradability is a standard information requirement at Annex VII of REACH.

You have provided studies 34}, 35}, 36}, 37}, 38}, 39}, 40} to fulfil this information requirement. ECHA understands that you claim that these studies were conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

- *Test material characterisation*

As explained in Section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation does not fulfil the requirements of REACH.

Reliability of studies

To comply with this information requirement, an OECD TG 301 B, C, D, F, or A/E (with adsorption control) or 310 study must be provided and cover the validity criteria and key parameters of the corresponding TG (Article 13(3) of REACH), which include:

- initial concentration of cells in inoculum.

Furthermore, for highly adsorptive substances OECD TG 301 A/E study must cover the key parameters of the corresponding TG (Article 13(3) of REACH), which include: an adsorption control.

For the provided studies 35}, 36}, 38}, 39}, 40} there is no information reported in the registration dossier about initial concentration of cells in inoculum used in the test.

Based on the information available in the registration dossier the Substance is surface active and could be present in ionised form, i.e. have potential for adsorption. Thus, measurements of dissolved organic carbon in the OECD TG 301 A/E could indicate the removal of a substance from the test medium by adsorption and not the ultimate biodegradation of such substance. Provided key study is performed according to EU Method C.4-A (i.e. similar methodology as OECD TG 301 A), the first supporting study according to OECD TG 301 E and for the study flagged as "other information" dissolved organic carbon was used to estimate degradation of the test material. There is no information on adsorption control reported in the registration dossier for these studies.

Consequently, such studies (i) are not reliable; (ii) cannot address standard information requirement of REACH Annexes VII, Section 9.2.1.1.; and (iii) are not adequate for the purpose of classification and labelling and/or risk assessment.

In the comments to the draft decision you state that your registration dossier was updated before the end of the commenting deadline. Please see ECHAs reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a.**

Other comments specific to the ready biodegradability are addressed in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests.

Thus, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

Appendix B: 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 a standard information requirement in Annex VIII to REACH.

You have provided a Grouping of substances and read-across approach adaptation to fulfill Column 2 of Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2., by providing an *In vivo* Mammalian chromosome aberration test (OECD TG 475, 1995) with an analogue substance. You claim that the test material was the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issues:

Test material characterisation

As explained in section (ii) in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation for the study that you claim was conducted with the Substance does not fulfil the requirements of REACH. The study is thus rejected. In addition, the following endpoint-specific deficiency has been identified:

Column 2 adaptation rejected

Column 2 of Annex VIII, Section 8.4.2. provides that an experimental study for this endpoint is not needed if adequate data from an *in vivo* cytogenicity test is available.

Based on the rejection of the grouping and read-across above, the information you provided does not fulfil the information requirement.

In the comments to the draft decision you state that your registration dossier was updated before the end of the commenting deadline. Please see ECHA's reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a**.

Therefore, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

2. In vitro gene mutation study in mammalian cells

An *in vitro* gene mutation study in mammalian cells is a standard information requirement in Annex VIII to REACH in case of a negative result in the *in vitro* gene mutation test in bacteria and the *in vitro* cytogenicity test.

Assessment of trigger

Your dossier contains data for an *in vitro* gene mutation study in bacteria, and data for an *in vivo* cytogenicity study.

The information for the *in vitro* gene mutation study in bacteria and for the *in vivo* cytogenicity study provided in the dossier are rejected for the reasons provided in section 1 of Appendix A and section 1 of this Appendix.

The results of the requests for *in vitro* gene mutation study in bacteria and for the *in vivo* cytogenicity study will determine whether the present requirement for an *in vitro* mammalian cell gene mutation study is triggered in accordance with Annex VIII, Section 8.4.3.

Assessment of information provided to address this information requirement

You have adapted this information requirement by using a Grouping of substances and read-across approach under Annex XI, Section 1.5. Furthermore, you have provided study 13} that you claim was conducted with the Substance.

As explained in Sections **(i)** and **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests your adaptation and study 13} are rejected and the information requirement is not fulfilled.

3. Justification for an adaptation of a Short-term repeated dose toxicity (28 days) based on the results of the Sub-chronic toxicity study (90 days)

A Short-term repeated dose toxicity study (28 days) is a standard information requirement in Annex VIII to REACH. This information may take the form of a study record or a valid adaptation in accordance with either a specific adaptation rule under Column 2 of Annex VIII or a general adaptation rule under Annex XI.

You have provided a Grouping of substances and read-across adaptation to fulfil Column 2 of Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1 in your dossier, by providing three oral subchronic studies, one oral chronic study and two dermal subchronic studies with analogue substances. Furthermore you have provided one study 1} that you claim was conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

Grouping and read-across rejected

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests your adaptation is rejected.

Test material characterisation

As explained in section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation for the study that you claim was conducted with the Substance does not fulfil the requirements of REACH. The study is thus rejected. In addition, the following deficiencies have been identified:

Key parameters & dosing regime

To comply with this information requirement the study must cover the dosing regime and key parameters of the test guideline. For the same reasons as explained in section **(i.)B.b.** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the key parameters and the dosing regime for the study that you claim was conducted with the Substance does not fulfil the requirements of REACH and OECD TG 408. The study is thus rejected.

Adequacy and reliability of source study – route of administration

To fulfil the information requirement on repeated dose toxicity in accordance with Annex IX, Section 8.6.2, the study must be conducted using the most appropriate route of exposure. According to the provisions of Column 2 of Annex IX, Section 8.6.2, testing by the dermal route is appropriate if the physico-chemical or toxicological properties suggest a significant rate of absorption through the skin.

Two source studies 6}, 7} that you have used in your read-across approach correspond

to sub-chronic toxicity studies by the dermal route performed similar to the OECD TG 411. In your dossier you claim that your substance has 1-2% absorption through the skin, based on data for analogue substances. The information provided in the dossier indicates a high hydrophilicity of the Substance based on the low log Kow, which does not suggest a significant rate of absorption through the skin.

The low absorption you claim is based on read-across which is rejected. In any case, the information provided does not suggest a significant rate of absorption through the skin. The indication of high hydrophilicity further contradicts any suggestion of significant absorption through the skin.

Therefore these studies were not conducted via the most appropriate route of administration and they cannot be used in the grouping approach.

Column 2 adaptation rejected

Column 2 of Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1. provides that an experimental study for this endpoint is not needed if a reliable sub-chronic (90 days) or chronic toxicity study is available.

Based on the rejection of the grouping and read-across above, the information you provided does not fulfil the information requirement.

The present decision requests the registrants concerned to generate and submit a reliable sub-chronic toxicity study (90 days) (see Section C.1). According to Column 2 of Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1., and to prevent unnecessary animal testing, a short term toxicity study (28 days) does not therefore need to be conducted.

Because you still must comply with the information requirement in Annex VIII, Section 8.6.1., you are requested to submit a justification for the adaptation provided in Column 2 of that provision.

4. Short-term toxicity testing on fish

Short-term toxicity testing on fish is a standard information requirement in Annex VIII to REACH.

You have provided studies 41}, 42} to fulfil this information requirement. ECHA understands that you claim that these studies were conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

- *Test material characterisation*

As explained in Section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation does not fulfil the requirements of REACH.

- *Adequacy of the study*

As explained in Section **(iv)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests all provided studies are not adequate.

Your comments to the draft decision specific to the short-term toxicity testing on fish are addressed in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests.

Thus, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

As the Substance is surface active, could be present in ionised form and have potential to degrade in the test medium, you need to consult the OECD Guidance Document (GD) 23 and ECHA Guidance, Chapter R7b, Table R.7.8-3 relating to the aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances, so that you choose the most appropriate design of the requested ecotoxicity test(s) and you best calculate and report the results of the test(s).

Appendix C: Reasons to request information required under Annex IX of REACH

1. Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day)

A Sub-chronic toxicity study (90 day) is a standard information requirement in Annex IX to REACH.

You have adapted this information requirement by using a Grouping of substances and read-across approach under Annex XI, Section 1.5. Furthermore, you have provided study 1} that you claim was conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issues:

Grouping and read-across rejected

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests your adaptation is rejected.

Test material characterisation

As explained in section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation for the study that you claim was conducted with the Substance does not fulfil the requirements of REACH. The study is thus rejected. In addition, the following endpoint-specific deficiencies have been identified:

Key parameters & dosing regime

To comply with this information requirement the study must cover the dosing regime and key parameters of the test guideline. For the same reasons as explained in section **i.B.b.** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the key parameters and the dosing regime for the study that you claim was conducted with the Substance does not fulfil the requirements of REACH and OECD TG 408. The study is thus rejected.

Adequacy and reliability of source study – route of administration

To fulfil the information requirement on repeated dose toxicity in accordance with Annex IX, Section 8.6.2, the study must be conducted using the most appropriate route of exposure. According to the provisions of Column 2 of Annex IX, Section 8.6.2, testing by the dermal route is appropriate if the physico-chemical or toxicological properties suggest a significant rate of absorption through the skin.

Two source studies 6}, 7} that you have used in your read-across approach correspond to sub-chronic toxicity studies by the dermal route performed similar to the OECD TG 411. In your dossier you claim that your substance has 1-2% absorption through the skin, based on data for analogue substances. The information provided in the dossier indicates a high hydrophilicity of the Substance based on the low log Kow, which does not suggest a significant rate of absorption through the skin.

The low absorption you claim is based on read-across which is rejected. In any case, the information provided does not suggest a significant rate of absorption through the skin. The indication of high hydrophilicity further contradicts any suggestion of significant absorption through the skin.

Therefore these studies were not conducted via the most appropriate route of administration and they cannot be used in the grouping approach.

In the comments to the draft decision you state that your registration dossier was updated before the end of the commenting deadline. Please see ECHAs reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a.**

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

Referring to the criteria provided in Annex IX, Section 8.6.2, Column 2, the oral route is the most appropriate route of administration to investigate repeated dose toxicity, because the Substance is a solid without a significant proportion (>1% on weight basis) of particles of inhalable size.

Therefore the sub-chronic toxicity study must be performed according to the OECD TG 408, in rats and with oral administration of the Substance.

2. Pre-natal developmental toxicity study in one species

A Pre-natal developmental toxicity (PNDT) study (OECD TG 414) in one species is a standard information requirement under Annex IX to REACH.

You have adapted this information requirement by using a Grouping of substances and read-across approach under Annex XI, Section 1.5. Furthermore, you have provided studies 16}. 17} that you claim were conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issues:

Grouping and read-across rejected

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests your adaptation is rejected.

Test material characterisation

As explained in section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation for the studies that you claim were conducted with the Substance does not fulfil the requirements of REACH. The studies are thus rejected. In addition, the following endpoint-specific deficiency has been identified:

Key parameters & dosing regime

To comply with this information requirement the study must cover the dosing regime and key parameters of the test guideline. For the same reasons as explained in section **(i.)B.b.** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the key parameters and dosing regime for the studies that you claim were conducted with the Substance do not fulfil the requirements of REACH and OECD TG 414. The studies are thus rejected.

In the comments to the draft decision you state that your registration dossier was updated before the end of the commenting deadline. Please see ECHAs reply to the same comment in the above section, **i.B.A.1.a.**

A PNDT study according to the test method OECD TG 414 must be performed in rat or rabbit

as preferred species with oral⁹ administration of the Substance.

3. Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates

Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates is a standard information requirement in Annex IX to the REACH Regulation.

You have adapted this information requirement by using a Grouping of substances and read-across approach under Annex XI, Section 1.5.

Furthermore, you provided one additional supporting study 25} to fulfil this information requirement. ECHA understands that you claim that this study was conducted with the Substance.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

- *Grouping and read-across rejected*

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests your adaptation is rejected.

- *Test material characterisation*

As explained in Section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation in supporting study 25} does not fulfil the requirements of REACH.

- *Adequacy of the study*

As explained in Section **(iv)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests supporting study 25} is not adequate. In addition, the following endpoint-specific deficiency has been identified:

As provided in Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, a read-across study must have adequate and reliable coverage of the key parameters addressed in the corresponding test method referred to in Article 13(3). To comply with this information requirement, an OECD TG 211 study must be provided. According to ECHA Guidance R.7b "*different objectives exist for conducting model ecosystem tests, not all test results may be equally useful, especially with respect to regulatory purposes*". Thus, the adequacy of such data for the purpose of risk assessment under REACH and classification/labelling should be considered and justified in the registration dossier.

Furthermore, as noted in the ECHA Guidance R.7b valid aquatic toxicity tests require the test substance to be dissolved in the water medium under the conditions recommended by the guideline, and the maintenance of a bioavailable exposure concentration for the duration of the test. According to the OECD TG 211 it is recommended that total organic carbon (TOC) levels would be below 2 mg/l.

There is no consideration on adequacy of the supporting study 24} which is experimental multiple species ecosystem study for the purpose of classification/labelling and risk assessment provided in the registration dossier.

⁹ ECHA Guidance R.7a, Section R.7.6.2.3.2.

Furthermore, concentration of the TOC present in the test medium was 4.8±0.9 mg/l which is higher than recommended TOC concentration in the OECD TG 211.

Thus, ECHA considers that source study, i.e. experimental multiple species ecosystem study, cannot be used for the category approach when adequacy of such study for the purpose of risk assessment under REACH and classification/labelling is not considered and justified in the registration dossier.

Your comments to the draft decision specific to the Long-term toxicity testing on aquatic invertebrates are addressed in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests.

Thus, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

As the Substance is surface active, could be present in ionised form and have potential to degrade in the test medium, you need to consult the OECD Guidance Document (GD) 23 and ECHA Guidance, Chapter R7b, Table R.7.8-3 relating to the aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances, so that you choose the most appropriate design of the requested ecotoxicity test(s) and you best calculate and report the results of the test(s).

4. Long-term toxicity testing on fish

Long-term toxicity testing on fish is a standard information requirement in Annex IX to the REACH Regulation.

You have provided a key study 26} to fulfil this information requirement. ECHA understands that you claim that this study was conducted with the Substance.

In addition, you have provided three supporting studies 27}, 28}, 29} with analogue substances.

We have assessed this information and identified the following issue(s):

- *Test material characterisation*

As explained in Section **(ii)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests the test material characterisation in the key study 26} does not fulfil the requirements of REACH.

- *Adequacy of the study*

As explained in Section **(iv)** in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests key study 26} is not adequate.

- *Grouping and read-across rejected*

As explained in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests your adaptation based on three supporting studies 27}, 28}, 29} with analogue substances is rejected.

- *Relevance of studies*

To meet this information requirement, a study must be a long-term fish test, which means studies in which sensitive life-stages (juveniles, eggs, larvae) are exposed (Section 9.1.6., Annex IX; Guidance R7b, section R.7.8.4.1).

You have provided a key study 26} and two supporting studies 27}, 29} which are according to information provided in the registration dossier are "Extended Acute toxicity test 45 d".

These studies are prolonged acute toxicity studies with fish mortality as the major endpoint examined (*additionally, the growth parameters weight and length of the test fish were determined at the start and the end of the test*), but it does not cover any sensitive life-stages (e.g. eggs, larvae).

Therefore, these three studies are not relevant for this information requirement and are rejected.

Your comments to the draft decision specific to the Long-term toxicity testing on fish are addressed in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests.

Thus, the information requirement is not fulfilled.

As the Substance is surface active, could be present in ionised form and have potential to degrade in the test medium, you need to consult the OECD Guidance Document (GD) 23 and ECHA Guidance, Chapter R7b, Table R.7.8-3 relating to the aquatic toxicity testing of difficult substances, so that you choose the most appropriate design of the requested ecotoxicity test(s) and you best calculate and report the results of the test(s).

Appendix D: Reasons to request information required under Annex X of REACH**1. Pre-natal developmental toxicity study (Annex X, Section 8.7.2.) in a second species**

Pre-natal developmental toxicity (PNDT) studies (OECD TG 414) in two species is a standard information requirement under Annex X to REACH.

You have adapted this information requirement:

- according to Annex X, Section 8.7.2, Column 2 third indent, and
- by using a *Weight of Evidence* approach under Annex XI, Section 1.2, that relies on studies submitted for *Grouping and read-across* according to Annex XI, Section 1.5. You provide the same arguments as for the column 2 adaptation, claiming that "*there is no indication of any systemic toxicity of AAPBs relevant in view of a potential health risk for humans, neither from sub-chronic data nor from developmental toxicity data.*"

We have assessed this information and identified the following issues:

Column 2 adaptation rejected

According to Annex X, Section 8.7., Column 2, third indent, the study does not need to be conducted if the substance is of low toxicological activity. This needs to be demonstrated with three concomitant criteria, two of them being:

- that there is no evidence of toxicity seen in any of the tests available; and
- that there is no or no significant human exposure.

Your claim is based on studies that have been rejected based on their unreliability. The following uses are provided in your registration dossier: [REDACTED]

ECHA assessment

As explained in the *Appendix on Reasons common to several requests* and in Appendices A-D, your studies are rejected and therefore cannot be used to demonstrate low toxicity. Furthermore, the uses of the Substance contradict your claim of no or no significant human exposure.

Weight of Evidence rejected for studies submitted for Grouping and read-across

Annex XI, Section 1.2 states that there may be sufficient 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 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.

We have identified the following critical deficiencies:

1. 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.
2. 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 with relevance to pre-natal developmental toxicity in a second species (study 21}).
3. You invoke the same arguments as for the column 2 adaptation of Annex X, Section 8.7.2, third indent. The use of the weight of evidence qualification, however, cannot be used to set a different, lower, threshold for accepting the adaptation set out in column 2 of Annex X, Section 8.7.2, as the justification provided in the dossier does not bring any additional elements for consideration.

In spite of these critical deficiencies, ECHA has nevertheless assessed the validity of your adaptation and identified the following issues:

To fulfil the information requirement, normally a study performed according to OECD TG 414 must be provided. OECD TG 414 requires the study to investigate key investigations, including external, skeletal and soft tissue alterations (variations and malformations) on a second species.

The sources of information 21} may provide relevant information on OECD 414's key investigations on a second species.

However, the reliability of these sources of information is significantly affected by the following deficiency:

The studies relied on for your claiming low or absence of pre-natal developmental toxicity are rejected, and unreliable for the reasons stated in the Appendix on Reasons common to several requests, sections **(i)** and **(ii)**.

As a conclusion, the source of information as indicated above, may provide information on the external, skeletal and soft tissue alterations, but the provided information is not reliable.

Accordingly, 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 properties foreseen to be investigated in an OECD TG 414 study in a second species. Therefore, your adaptation is rejected and the information requirements is not fulfilled.

Information on study design

A PNNDT study according to the OECD TG 414 study should be performed in rabbit or rat as the preferred second species, depending on the species tested in the first PNNDT study (request C.2 in this decision).

The study shall be performed with oral¹⁰ administration of the Substance.

¹⁰ ECHA Guidance R.7a, Section R.7.6.2.3.2.

Appendix E: 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 summaries¹¹.

B. Test material

Selection of the test material(s) for UVCB substances

The Lead Registrant of the joint submission has to report boundary composition as part of their dossier. Each individual member has a responsibility to ensure that the data provided for Annex VII-X is relevant for their substance as it is manufactured. Members should ensure that their compositional information is reported so that it is coherent and within the boundaries of what is reported in the boundary composition record(s).

The registrants of the Substance are responsible for agreeing on the composition of the test material to be selected for carrying out the tests required by the present decision. The test material selected must be relevant for all the registrants of the Substance, i.e. it takes into account the variation in compositions reported by all members of the joint submission. The composition of the test material(s) must fall within the boundary composition(s) of the Substance.

While selecting the test material you must take into account 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. Any constituents that have harmonised classification and labelling according to the CLP Regulation (Regulation (EC) No 1272/2008) must be identified and quantified using the appropriate analytical methods.

The OECD Series on Principles of Good Laboratory Practice and Compliance Monitoring, Number 11 [ENV/MC/CHEM(98)16] requires a careful identification of the test material and description of its characteristics. In addition, the Test Methods Regulation (EU) 440/2008, as amended by Regulation (EU) 2016/266, requires that "if the test method is used for the testing of a [...] UVCB [...] sufficient information on its composition should

¹¹ <https://echa.europa.eu/practical-guides>

be made available, as far as possible, e.g. by the chemical identity of its constituents, their quantitative occurrence, and relevant properties of the constituents”.

In order to meet this requirement, all the constituents of the test material used for each test must be identified as far as possible. For each constituent the concentration value in the test material must be reported in the Test material section of the endpoint study record.

Technical Reporting of the test material for UVCB substances

The composition of the selected test material must be reported in the respective endpoint study record, under the Test material section. The composition must include all constituents of the test material and their concentration values. Without such detailed reporting, ECHA may not be able to confirm that the test material is relevant for the Substance and to all the registrants of the Substance.

Therefore, you must provide information on the distribution of the ethoxylate groups amongst constituents, including for certain constituents with a lack of ethoxylation. Furthermore, differences in the alkyl chains (length, potential branching and saturation, as relevant) need to be accounted for. This also means providing breakdown of the composition so that:

- Constituents must be reported based on the alkyl chain length
- Linear and branched constituents should be reported separately (if relevant)
- To the extent possible, each ethoxylation degree (per alcohol) should be identified and reported separately.
- If it is not possible to identify and quantify all individual constituents present in the test material, grouping may be needed for example for constituents with higher ethoxylation degrees (EO 4+).

As an example: [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] would need to be listed as separate constituents.

Technical instructions are available in the manual "How to prepare registration and PPORD dossiers" on the ECHA website¹².

¹² <https://echa.europa.eu/manuals>

Appendix F: General recommendations when conducting and reporting new tests for REACH purposes

A. Testing strategy for aquatic toxicity testing

You are advised to consult ECHA Guidance R.7b, (Section R.7.8.5) which describes the Integrated Testing Strategy, to determine the sequence of aquatic toxicity tests and testing needed.

B. Environmental testing for substances containing multiple constituents

Your Substance is a UVCB and, as indicated in ECHA Guidance R.11 (Section R.11.4.2.2), you are advised to consider the following approaches for persistency, bioaccumulation and aquatic toxicity testing:

- the "known constituents approach" (by assessing specific constituents), or
- the "fraction/block approach, (performed on the basis of fractions/blocks of constituents), or
- the "whole substance approach", or
- various combinations of the approaches described above

Selection of the appropriate approach must take into account the possibility to characterise the Substance (i.e. knowledge of its constituents and/or fractions and any differences in their properties) and the possibility to isolate or synthesize its relevant constituents and/or fractions.

Appendix G: Procedure

The information requirement for an Extended one-generation reproductive toxicity study (EOGRTS; Annexes IX or X, Section 8.7.3.) is not addressed in this decision. This may be addressed in a separate decision once the information from the Sub-chronic toxicity study (90-day) requested in the present decision is provided; due to the fact that the results from the 90-day study is needed for the design of the EOGRTS. Similarly the information requirement for a Screening for reproductive/developmental toxicity (Annex VIII, Section 8.7.1.) is not addressed in this decision; as the EOGRTS will cover the same parameters.

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 24 July 2019.

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

ECHA took into account your comments and did not amend the requests.

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

As no amendments were proposed, ECHA adopted the decision under Article 51(3) of REACH.

Appendix H: List of references - ECHA Guidance¹³ and other supporting documentsEvaluation 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)¹⁴

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 documents¹⁵

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

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 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.

CLP Guidance

CLP Guidance on the Application of the CLP Criteria (Version 5.0, July 2017), referred to as CLP Guidance

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.

